MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
DIVERSION, PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA JR., CALEPA BUILDING

COASTAL HEARING ROOM

1001 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2003 9:00 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

ii

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Steven R. Jones, Chairperson

Jose Medina

Cheryl Peace

STAFF

Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Pat Schiavo, Deputy Director

Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Eric Bissinger

Rebecca Brown

Nancy Carr

Kaoru Cruz

Kathy Davis

Betty Fernandez

Keir Furey

Maria Kakutani

Cedar Kehoe

Phil Moralez

Cara Morgan

Trevor O'Shaughnessy

Kyle Pogue

Zane Poulson

Tom Rudy

iii

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF

Yasmin Satter

Jill Simmons

Steve Sorelle

Steve Uselton

Jennifer Wallin

ALSO PRESENT

John Bran, City of Moopark

Liz Citrino, Constultant

Steve Devine, West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority

Sue Gordon, Orange County

Doug Kobold, Sacramento County

Rick Mauck, City of Santa Clara

Michael Meacham, Chula Vista

Mike Miller, Solid Waste Manager, City of Stockton

Jason Smisko, City of Santa Clarita

iv

INDEX	
	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
A. Deputy Director's Report	3
B. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Sacramento County/City Of Citrus Heights Regional Agency (February Board Item 1) Motion Vote	6 8 8
C. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Concord, Contra Costa County (February Board Item 2) Motion Vote	8 10 10
D. Consideration Of The Adequacy Of The Five-Year Review Report Of The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan For The County Of San Bernardino (February Board Item 25) Motion Vote	10 11 12
E. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Element For The Town Of Hillsborough, San Mateo County (February Board Item 26) Motion Vote	12 13 14
F. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of American Canyon, Napa County (February Board Item 27) Motion Vote	14 17 17

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
G. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Napa, Napa County (February Board Item 28) Motion Vote	14 17 18
H. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Unincorporated Area Of Napa County (February Board Item 29) Motion Vote	14 18 18
I. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Element For The City Of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County (February Board Item 30) Motion Vote	18 21 21
J. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Town Of Atherton, San Mateo County (February Board Item 31) Motion Vote	18 21 22
K. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Ojai, Ventura County (February Board Item 32) Motion Vote	22 23 24
L. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of La Mesa, San Diego County (February Board Item 33) Motion Vote	24 25 25

vi

INDEX CONTINUED	
	PAGE
M. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Agoura Hills, Los Angeles County (February Board Item 34) Motion Vote	25 27 28
N. PULLED Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of Issuance Of A Compliance Order Relative To The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Amador County Integrated Solid Waste Management Agency (February Board Item 35)	
O. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Ferndale, Humboldt County (February Board Item 36) Motion Vote	28 31 31
P. Consideration Of A Petition For A Rural Reduction Of The Diversion Requirements, And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Rio Dell, Humboldt County (February Board Item 37) Motion Vote	32 35 35
Q. PULLED Consideration Of A Petition For A Rural Reduction Of The Diversion Requirements, And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling	

Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Portola, Plumas County -- (February Board Item 38)

vii

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
R. Consideration Of A Request To Extend The Due Date For Submittal Of The Source Reduction And Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element, And Nondisposal Facility Element By the City Of Aliso Viejo, Orange County (February Board Item 39) Motion Vote	35 37 38
S. PULLED Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Of Brisbane, San Mateo County (February Board Item 40)	
T. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Of Santee, San Diego County (February Board Item 41) Motion Vote	38 40 40
U. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The Unincorporated Areas Of The County Of Orange (February Board Item 42) Motion Vote	40 43 44
V. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Laguna Hills, Orange County (February Board Item 43) Motion Vote	48 48 49
W. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension For The City Of Port Hueneme, Ventura County (February Board Item 44) Motion Vote	49 50 51
X. PULLED Consideration Of The Applications For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The Cities Of Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria, Holtville, Imperial, Westmorland, Imperial County	

(February Board Item 45)

viii

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
Y. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Of Kerman, Fresno County (February Board Item 46) 51 Motion Vote	53 53
Z. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Of Mendota, Fresno County (February Board Item 47) Motion Vote	51 53 54
AA. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Time Extension By The Unincorporated San Bernardino County (February Board Item 48) Motion Vote	54 57 57
AB. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Time Extension By The City Of Adelanto, San Bernardino County (February Board Item 49) Motion Vote	54 57 57
AC. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Time Extension By The Unincorporated Area Of Nevada County (February Board Item 50) Motion Vote	57 60 60
AD. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Of Chula Vista, San Diego County (February Board Item 51) Motion Vote	61 68 68
AE. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Time Extension By The City Of Pomona, Los Angeles County (February Board Item 52) Motion Vote	69 70 70

ix

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
AF. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Time Extension By The City Of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County (February Board Item 53) Motion Vote	70 74 74
AG. PULLED Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Davis, Yolo County (February Board Item 54)	
AH. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Banning, Riverside County (February Board Item 55) Motion Vote	75 79 79
AI. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Corona, Riverside County (February Board Item 56) Motion Vote	55 80 80
AJ. Consideration Of A Request To Correct The Base Year For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Twentynine Palms, San Bernardino County (February Board Item 57) Motion Vote	80 82 82

X

INDEX CONTINUED

INDEN CONTINUED	PAGE
AK. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Avenal, Kings County (February Board Item 58) Motion Vote	83 84 85
AL. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1999 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Santa Clara, Santa Clara County (February Board Item 59) Motion Vote	85 87 87
AM. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2001 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management Authority, Contra Costa County (February Board Item 60) Motion Vote	89 91 91
AN. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Moorpark, Ventura County (February Board Item 61) Motion Vote	91 94 94
AO. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Yea To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Unincorporated Area Of Nevada County (February Board Item 62) Motion	57 60 60

xi

INDEX CONTINUED

INDEA CONTINUED	PAGE
AP. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction and Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Laguna Hills, Orange County (February Board Item 63) Motion Vote	44 48 48
AQ. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Manteca, San Joaquin County (February Board Item 64) Motion Vote	94 96 96
AR. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Modesto, Stanislaus County (February Board Item 65) Motion Vote	97 98 99
AS. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Stockton, San Joaquin County (February Board Item 66) Motion Vote	99 102 103
AT. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County (February Board Item 67) Motion Vote	70 73 73

xii

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
AU. Consideration Of Contractor For The Contract To Update Statewide Waste Characterization Of Disposed Waste Including Rigid Plastic Packaging Containers And Used Oil Containers (FY 2002-03 Contract Concept 18) (February Board Item 68 And Budget And	
Administration Item D)	103
Motion	114
Vote	114
AV. Status Update Of The Review Process For The Submitted State Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Reports (AB 75) For 2002 (February Board Item 69)	114
Adjournment	121
Reporter's Certificate	122

PROCEEDINGS

- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning. And welcome to
- 3 the February 5th meeting of the Diversion, Planning and
- 4 Local Assistance Committee.
- 5 Before we take the roll, anybody that has cell
- 6 phones on, could you put them on vibrator or shut them off
- 7 so that we don't get interrupted during the meeting.
- 8 Anybody that would like to speak on an item,
- 9 there are speaker slips in the back of the room. Fill it
- 10 out and bring it up to Jeannine Bakulich up here and
- 11 she'll get it to us.
- 12 For those of you who haven't been in front of
- 13 this Committee, we move. And we will ask pertinent
- 14 questions, but we do move. Don't think that means that we
- 15 are disinterested. It normally means that we've gotten a
- 16 good enough staff report that we can get our jobs done.
- Jeannine, would you call the roll.
- 18 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Here.
- 20 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Peace?
- 21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Here.
- 22 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?
- 23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Here.
- We have a quorum.
- 25 I will make an announcement. Anybody that is

1 here and plans on hanging around for our Admin Committee

- 2 meeting, the Admin Committee meeting has been cancelled.
- 3 One of our members had a medical emergency within the
- 4 family that he had to take care of, which meant we don't
- 5 have a quorum. It was totally unexpected. It happened
- 6 yesterday.
- 7 So we'll hear those items -- a lot of those items
- 8 actually are on fiscal consensus from other policy
- 9 committees. So it will probably be up to the Chair and
- 10 Vice Chair and the Executive Committee as to how you'll
- 11 treat those items at the Board meeting.
- 12 We do only have a single day Board meeting next
- 13 week.
- 14 All right. Any ex partes?
- Board Member Peace.
- 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: My ex partes are up to
- 17 date.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- 19 Board Member Medina.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Up to date.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- 22 I just have a couple. I said hello to Mr. South
- 23 and Mr. -- my mind is going, just out of control -- Snyder
- 24 and other folks out there, just said hello. Didn't do any
- 25 business.

- 1 All right. Mr. Schiavo.
- Deputy Director's report.
- 3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes, sir.
- 4 Pat Schiavo, Diversion, Planning and Local
- 5 Assistance Division.
- And what I'll do, because we have so many items,
- 7 just a brief overview of what to expect in the coming
- 8 months.
- 9 While this month's binder's about 7 inches thick,
- 10 we anticipate next month's binder being about 5 inches and
- 11 about 30 plus items. And then the following month in
- 12 April we anticipate probably 6 to 10 items.
- And then we're going to plan on conducting the
- 14 single stream workshop. So I believe that will be April
- 15 9th. And we will be publicizing that as we get closer to
- 16 the date.
- 17 And, finally, in May we anticipate bringing
- 18 forward our recommendations for the Unified Education
- 19 Strategy grants. Those should be coming in to us at the
- 20 end of this month. And then we'll go through the review
- 21 process and bring them forward.
- 22 So that's my update.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Schiavo, before we start
- 24 with the agenda item, I want to use this opportunity.
- 25 Just a couple things. Mr. Schiavo did say we are

```
1 going to have a workshop on single stream in April.
```

- 2 Single stream I think is probably one of the best things
- 3 that have come down the road in a long, long time,
- 4 especially when we're looking at operational issues and
- 5 costs savings, getting the most out of limited dollars.
- 6 I am very, very concerned though -- and I will
- 7 make comments on certain items that are coming forward
- 8 today. Cities are putting down SB 1066 -- in their SB
- 9 1066 extensions that they're going to single stream. The
- 10 cities still in my view have a responsibility to make sure
- 11 that education is done of the public that's using it and
- 12 enforcement, code enforcement for contamination. A city
- 13 that does not participate in that part of the system is
- 14 going to ultimately make sure that single stream fails.
- 15 Because the whole idea of single stream is very similar to
- 16 what it was when we were doing three bins. You've got to
- 17 have a clean source of material going through a facility.
- 18 Unfortunately I see folks go to a conference and
- 19 hear that everything the world could be recycled, so they
- 20 decide that they're going to have 37 items in a single
- 21 stream system. And all that usually does is help to
- 22 contaminate the system, stop the performance of that
- 23 machinery because of somebody's idea that you can recycle
- 24 visqueen and plastic wrap in a single stream system. Once
- 25 it gets caught up in those disk screens, you just shut

- 1 down the entire system.
- 2 So it's important for cities to understand that
- 3 it's going to be an issue for this Board Member, that just
- 4 by identifying the program and not going that extra step
- 5 on education and code enforcement, if we're seeing high
- 6 residual rates, 20, 25, 26, 28, 30 percent residual,
- 7 that's a failed program. And it's a failed program
- 8 usually because of lack of education.
- 9 So we need to be aware. On all of these SB
- 10 1066's that are coming forward today that have indicated
- 11 that, I'm going to make a comment that I -- you know, and
- 12 some I saw where cities actually identified that in their
- 13 single stream system they've got 8 percent residual.
- 14 That's a good system. But I also know systems out there
- 15 to that 30 and 35 percent. And we're going to deal with
- 16 that in this workshop. But I'm going to deal with it and
- 17 I think the Board Members are going to deal with it as we
- 18 learn more about it every time we see somebody coming
- 19 forward. It's not just having the program, it's doing the
- 20 program and doing it right.
- 21 So part of this is just education. Cities and
- 22 recycling coordinators need to understand they've got a
- 23 role, because citizens listen to cities a lot more than
- 24 they do operators and processors. So as long as people
- 25 are working together, I think this is going to be probably

1 the most successful systems that we've seen, and will make

- 2 a huge impact in diversion in the State of California if
- 3 we do it right.
- 4 Mr. Schiavo.
- 5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Before we start I'd
- 6 like to mention that items 35, 40, 45, and 54 have been
- 7 pulled. And as we go through the agenda there'll be a few
- 8 times that we'll pull out of order because of the
- 9 logistics of the presentations.
- 10 Okay. We'd like to start with Item Number 1,
- 11 which is a continued item. And I'm going to be very brief
- 12 with the introductions.
- 13 Item Number 1 is consideration of 1999-2000
- 14 biennial review findings for the County of Sacramento and
- 15 City of Citrus Heights Regional Agency.
- 16 And Kyle Rogue will make the presentation.
- 17 MR. POGUE: Good morning, Committee members.
- 18 Kyle Pogue, Office of Local Assistance.
- 19 The item before you for the Sacramento
- 20 County/City of Citrus Heights Regional Agency was
- 21 continued from the January Committee agenda to allow the
- 22 regional agency to include increased diversion data. This
- 23 additional data, meeting all restricted waste criteria,
- 24 reflects the increased diversion of inert materials by
- 25 several large construction companies. The additional data

- 1 has been incorporated into the revised item and
- 2 attachments that were provided to you today.
- 3 Regional agency originally submitted a 2000
- 4 generation study request with a diversion rate of 50
- 5 percent. As part of the generation study review, Board
- 6 staff conducted several detailed site visits to determine
- 7 accuracy of the diversion claims.
- 8 With Board staff recommended changes, the
- 9 agency's diversion rate is 55 percent for its proposed
- 10 2000 generation study. Board staff recommended changes
- 11 can be seen in Attachment 3 of the agenda item packet.
- 12 Staff also conducted a review of the regional
- 13 agency's diversion programs. The agency reported that it
- 14 has successfully implemented source reduction, recycling
- 15 and composting and public education programs in order to
- 16 meet the 50 percent diversion mandate.
- 17 Based on this information, Board staff is
- 18 recommending Option 1, that would approve the 2000
- 19 generation based calculation with staff recommended
- 20 changes and accept the 1999-2000 biennial review findings.
- 21 Doug Kobold from the agency is available to
- 22 answer any questions.
- 23 And that concludes my presentation.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- 25 Members, any questions?

- 1 Mr. Medina.
- 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Board Member Jones, I'd
- 3 like to move Resolution 2003-41, consideration of the
- 4 '99-20000 biennial review findings for the Source
- 5 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
- 6 Waste Element for the Sacramento County/City of Citrus
- 7 Heights Regional Agency.
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I Second it.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 10 Member Medina, second by Board Member Peace.
- 11 Would you please call the roll.
- 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: That was Resolution
- 13 2003-41 revised?
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yes.
- 15 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?
- 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 17 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Peace?
- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.
- 19 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.
- 21 Thank you.
- 22 Item Number 2.
- 23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This is consideration
- 24 of a request to change the base year to 2000 for the City
- 25 of Concord, Contra Costa County.

- 1 And Eric Bissinger will present.
- 2 MR. BISSINGER: Good morning, Board Members.
- 3 This is a continued item from January 2003. The
- 4 City of Concord submitted a request to change their base
- 5 year from 1990 to 2000. The City of Concord originally
- 6 submitted a new base-year change request with a diversion
- 7 rate of 50 percent for 2000.
- 8 As part of the base-year study review Board staff
- 9 conducted a detailed site visit on December 2002. As a
- 10 result staff is recommending some changes to the diversion
- 11 study. The changes proposed by Board staff can be seen in
- 12 their in entirety in Attachment 3.
- 13 With these changes Concord's diversion rate for
- 14 2000 would remain 50 percent. Board staff has determined
- 15 that the base-year change request is adequately documented
- 16 and the city level of program implementation was also
- 17 adequate. Staff, therefore, recommends the Board adopt
- 18 Option 2, approve the city's base-year change request with
- 19 staff's recommended changes and also find that the City of
- 20 Concord has met the 2000 diversion requirements.
- 21 Representatives of Concord are present to answer
- 22 any questions.
- 23 And that concludes my presentation.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Just one question.
- These new resolutions, we're going to title these

```
1 as revised, right? Or what's the deal?
```

- 2 We'll do a revised and then you can tell us
- 3 later.
- 4 All right. Any questions, members?
- 5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No question.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Medina.
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like
- 8 to move Resolution 2003-56 revised, consideration of a
- 9 request to change the base year to 2000 for the previously
- 10 approved Source Reduction and Recycling Element; and the
- 11 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for
- 12 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
- 13 Hazardous Waste Element for the City of Concord, Contra
- 14 Costa County.
- 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Board
- 17 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 18 Substitute the previous roll?
- 19 On consent?
- Thank you, members.
- 21 And the first item, on consent?
- Okay. So the first two are on consent.
- Next item.
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item Number 25
- 25 is consideration of the adequacy of the five-year review

- 1 report for the County of San Bernardino.
- 2 And Rebecca Brown will present.
- 3 MS. BROWN: Good morning.
- 4 The San Bernardino County Solid Waste Advisory
- 5 Task Force has submitted a report of its five-year review
- 6 of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan.
- 7 In concurrence with the county the Solid Waste
- 8 Advisory Task Force determined that a revision of the
- 9 county's plan was not necessary at this time.
- 10 Board staff has evaluated the county's review
- 11 report and determined that the required elements have been
- 12 addressed. Therefore, it is staff's recommendation that
- 13 the Board approve the county's assessment that no revision
- 14 is necessary.
- 15 Rex Richardson from the county is available to
- 16 answer any questions.
- 17 And this concludes my presentation. Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No questions.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Medina.
- 21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like
- 22 to move Resolution 2003-88, consideration of the adequacy
- 23 of the five-year review report of the Countywide
- 24 Integrated Waste Management Plan for the County of San
- 25 Bernardino.

```
1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
```

- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Mr.
- 3 Medina, second by Board Member Peace.
- 4 Substitute the previous roll?
- 5 On consent?
- Thank you, members.
- 7 Next.
- 8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 26 is
- 9 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
- 10 for the Town of Hillsborough, San Mateo County.
- 11 And Keir Furey will present.
- 12 MR. FUREY: Good morning, Committee members.
- 13 Staff conducted the 1999-2000 biennial review for
- 14 the Town of Hillsborough and found that the town had
- 15 achieved a 2000 diversion rate of 52 percent and that the
- 16 jurisdiction is adequately implementing source reduction,
- 17 recycling, composting, and public education in information
- 18 programs, as outlined in their Source Reduction and
- 19 Recycling Element and their Household Hazardous Waste
- 20 Element.
- 21 Board staff conducted a site visit to verify
- 22 that the jurisdiction's diversion program's implementation
- 23 is solid in its foundation and effectiveness.
- 24 For the Town of Hillsborough some of the major
- 25 programs that have been implemented include a residential

1 curbside recycling collection, residential curbside green

- 2 waste collection and green waste drop off, and
- 3 construction and demolition recycling ordinance with
- 4 technical outreach.
- 5 Staff recommends the Board adopt Option 1,
- 6 approve the staff's 1999-2000 biennial review findings of
- 7 the town's SRRE and HHWE.
- 8 This concludes my presentation.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 10 Mr. Medina.
- 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: The only question I
- 12 have was on page 26-5. In the findings, you say, "Board
- 13 staff has determined the Town of San Mateo" -- should that
- 14 be Hillsborough?
- MR. FUREY: It must be, yes.
- 16 (Laughter.)
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good catch.
- 18 (Laughter.) That's a good one.
- 19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: They're incorporated.
- 20 (Laughter.)
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah.
- 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Big difference. San
- 23 Mateo.
- I'd like to move Resolution 2003-89,
- 25 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for

1 Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household

- 2 Hazardous Waste Element for the Town of Hillsborough, San
- 3 Mateo County.

4

- 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Board Member
- 6 Medina.
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And a second by Board Member
- 9 Peace.
- 10 Substitute the previous roll, members?
- 11 On consent?
- 12 Thank you.
- 13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We'd like to combine
- 14 27, 28, and 29. And these are consideration of the
- 15 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the cities of
- 16 American Canyon, Napa, and Napa unincorporated.
- 17 And Betty Fernandez will present these items.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So the presentation
- 19 will be on all three of these items?
- 20 MS. FERNANDEZ: Right.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And then we'll take them
- 22 three separate.
- MS. FERNANDEZ: Good morning, Committee members.
- 24 Staff has conducted a 1999-2000 biennial review
- 25 for the cities of Napa City and American Canyon and Napa

- 1 unincorporated in Napa County and finds that these
- 2 jurisdictions are adequately implementing source
- 3 reduction, recycling, composting, public education, and
- 4 information programs.
- 5 In addition, staff found that these jurisdictions
- 6 have achieved a 2000 diversion rate of at least 50
- 7 percent, including not more than 10 percent diversion for
- 8 biomass.
- 9 As shown in the handout for these items, the
- 10 jurisdictions' 1999 and 2000 diversion rates would change
- 11 as follows if the biomass claims are approved:
- 12 For the City of Napa the diversion rate for 1999
- 13 was 54 percent and 59 percent for 2000. Including biomass
- 14 tonnage for the 2000 diversion rate, it would increase to
- 15 65 percent.
- 16 For the City of American Canyon the diversion
- 17 rate for 1999 was 48 percent and 46 percent for 2000.
- 18 Include biomass tonnage for 2000 and the diversion rate
- 19 increases to 55 percent.
- 20 For Napa unincorporated the diversion rate for
- 21 1999 was 61 percent and 52 percent for 2000. Include
- 22 biomass tonnage for 2000 and the diversion rate increases
- 23 to 56 percent.
- 24 In addition, staff conducted site visits 2002 and
- 25 verified that each jurisdiction's diversion program

- 1 implementation is solid in its foundation and
- 2 effectiveness, which is the basis for the staff's
- 3 recommendation.
- 4 Should the Board not accept staff's
- 5 recommendations, Napa unincorporated and American Canyon
- 6 have reserved the right in their 2000 annual report to
- 7 submit an SB 1066 time extension request.
- 8 The City of Napa did not elect to reserve the
- 9 right in their 2000 annual report to submit the SB 1066
- 10 extension request.
- 11 Because these jurisdictions have demonstrated
- 12 that they are adequately implementing their SRRE and HHWE
- 13 and have implemented the 50 percent diversion requirement
- 14 and have documented that they have met the conditions for
- 15 claiming biomass diversion in 2000, staff recommends the
- 16 Board approves staff's biennial review findings for these
- 17 jurisdictions and the biomass diversion credit.
- 18 Amy Garden for the County of Napa and Kevin
- 19 Miller from the City of Napa are available to address any
- 20 questions.
- 21 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Do any members have any
- 23 questions?
- I know that unincorporated county did its base
- 25 year. And the difference was you found an extra 62 tons.

1 I mean that's encouraging when, you know, you go out and

- 2 we're not missing 85,000 tons, and actually, you know,
- 3 finding it.
- 4 So good job.
- 5 All right. We've got three resolutions, members.
- 6 Any questions?
- 7 Mr. Medina.
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like
- 9 to move Resolution 2003-90, consideration of the '99-2000
- 10 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 11 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
- 12 for the City of American Canyon, Napa County.
- 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Member
- 15 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 16 Substitute the previous roll?
- 17 On consent?
- 18 Mr. Medina.
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 20 Resolution 2003-91, consideration of the '99-2000 biennial
- 21 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
- 22 Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the City
- 23 of Napa, Napa County.
- 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion Mr. Medina, a

```
1 second by Member Peace.
```

- 2 Substitute the previous roll?
- 3 On consent?
- 4 Thank you, members.
- 5 Mr. Medina.
- 6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I would like to move
- 7 Resolution 2003-92, consideration of the '99-2000 biennial
- 8 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
- 9 Element and the Household Hazardous Waste Element for the
- 10 unincorporated area of Napa County.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina.
- 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: A second by Member Peace.
- 14 Substitute the previous roll?
- 15 On consent?
- Thank you, members.
- 17 Thank you, staff.
- 18 Next item.
- 19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We would like to
- 20 combine Items 30 and 31. And these are consideration of
- 21 the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the cities of
- 22 Half Moon Bay and Atherton, both in San Mateo County.
- 23 And Keir Furey will present.
- MR. FUREY: Good morning, Committee members.
- 25 Staff conducted the 1999-2000 biennial review for

- 1 the City of Half Moon Bay and the Town of Atherton and
- 2 found that the City of Half Moon Bay had achieved a
- 3 diversion rate of 46 percent and the Town of Atherton had
- 4 achieved a diversion rate of 55 percent.
- 5 Staff also found that these jurisdictions are
- 6 adequately implementing source reduction, recycling,
- 7 composting, public education, and information programs as
- 8 outlined in their Source Reduction and Recycling Element
- 9 and Household Hazardous Waste Element.
- 10 Board staff conducted a site visits to verify
- 11 that each jurisdiction's diversion program implementation
- 12 is solid in its foundation and effectiveness.
- 13 The City of Half Moon Bay, some of the major
- 14 programs that have been implemented are the residential
- 15 curbside recycling collection program, residential green
- 16 waste collection, a commercial recycling collection, and a
- 17 commercial and residential green waste drop off at the
- 18 landfill.
- 19 The Town of Atherton, some of the major programs
- 20 that have been implemented include, again, a residential
- 21 curbside recycling collection, residential curbside green
- 22 waste collection, commercial green waste drop off, and a
- 23 construction and demolition recycling ordinance with
- 24 technical outreach.
- 25 For the City of Half Moon Bay, staff recommends

- 1 the Board adopt Option 1, accept staff's 1999-2000 SRRE
- 2 and HHWE biennial review findings that the city has made a
- 3 good-faith effort to implement diversion programs.
- 4 For the Town of Atherton staff recommends the
- 5 Board adopt Option 1, that would approve the staff's
- 6 1999-2000 biennial review findings of the town's SRRE and
- 7 HHWE.
- 8 Representatives for the City of Half Moon Bay are
- 9 present to answer any questions.
- 10 This concludes my presentation.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 12 I just have a couple things.
- I want to congratulate Half Moon Bay. About
- 14 three years ago, we had a problem with some -- I think it
- 15 was C&D or something, that the whole county had kind of
- 16 split up, and Half Moon Bay was not taking advantage of
- 17 some things. And the consultant came in and worked with
- 18 that whole area and actually got that stuff distributed
- 19 where it needed to be distributed.
- 20 And I'll just point out to people the number that
- 21 we're approving is not 50 percent. But our staff was able
- 22 to find that the programs are real, and that's why this is
- 23 going to go forward under good faith. There is a big
- 24 difference. We've had ones that have had numbers of 48
- 25 and 49 where we told them, "You need to go on an SB 1066,"

1 because their programs were not reflective of the numbers.

- 2 So I appreciate the analysis, as I know all the
- 3 other members do. But I think it's important to say
- 4 because we do get accused of looking at the numbers a
- 5 little bit too much. But when you can show that the
- 6 programs are supporting the number and the activity, you
- 7 deserve a good faith effort.
- 8 Any other questions?
- 9 Mr. Medina.
- 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like
- 11 to move Resolution 2003-93, consideration of the '99-2000
- 12 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 13 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
- 14 for the City of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County.
- 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Member
- 17 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 18 Substitute the previous roll, members?
- 19 On consent?
- Okay. Mr. Medina.
- 21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 22 Resolution 2003-94, consideration of the '99-2000 biennial
- 23 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
- 24 Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the Town
- 25 of Atherton, San Mateo County.

- 1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We've got a motion by
- 3 Board Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 4 Substitute the previous roll?
- 5 On consent?
- 6 Thank you, members.
- 7 Thank you, staff.
- 8 Next item.
- 9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 32 is
- 10 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
- 11 for the City of Ojai, Ventura County.
- 12 Steve Sorelle will present.
- 13 MR. SORELLE: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
- 14 Committee members.
- 15 The City of Ojai submitted a generation-base
- 16 study for the years 1999 and 2000. The city originally
- 17 requested diversion rates of 55 percent for both years.
- 18 With Board staff recommended changes, the city's diversion
- 19 rate was determined for '99 to be 34 percent and 47
- 20 percent for the year 2000.
- 21 As part of this generation study review Board
- 22 staff conducted detailed site visits. Changes proposed by
- 23 Board staff can be seen in their entirety in the
- 24 Attachment 3 for each study year in your packet.
- 25 Some of the major diversion programs that the

- 1 city has implemented include curbside collection of
- 2 residential recyclables and green waste, commercial
- 3 uni-cycling program in which business and schools receive
- 4 curbside collection of recyclables.
- 5 Various options for the collection and recycling
- 6 of C&D materials and grass cycling and mulching in city
- 7 parks and golf courses and on resort grounds.
- 8 Despite the reduction of the city-proposed
- 9 diversion rate for 2000, Board staff believes the city's
- 10 47 percent diversion rate and good program developments,
- 11 our recommendation is the Board find the City of Ojai has
- 12 made a good-faith effort in meeting diversion
- 13 requirements.
- 14 A representative for the city is present to
- 15 answer questions.
- This concludes my presentation. Thank you.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- 18 Members, any questions?
- 19 Mr. Medina.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No questions at this
- 21 time.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right.
- 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: With that I'd like to
- 24 move Resolution 2003-95, consideration of the '99-2000
- 25 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and

1 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element

- 2 for the City of Ojai, Ventura County.
- 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Member
- 5 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 6 Substitute the previous roll?
- 7 On consent?
- 8 Thank you, members.
- 9 Next item.
- 10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 33 is
- 11 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
- 12 for the city of La Mesa, San Diego County.
- 13 Zane Poulson will present.
- MR. POULSON: Good morning Committee members.
- 15 The city of La Mesa's diversion rate for 1999 was
- 16 42 percent and in 2000 was 43 percent. To determine the
- 17 level of program implementation staff analyzed historic
- 18 diversion rate trend, where rates have remained above 40
- 19 percent from 1995 through 2000; and conducted a
- 20 verification site visit in 2002.
- 21 Some of major programs that have been implemented
- 22 include residential commingled curbside collection,
- 23 residential curbside green waste collection, commercial
- 24 on-site commingled collection, and construction and
- 25 demolition diversion.

1 Staff recommends the Board find the City La Mesa

- 2 has made a good-faith effort in meeting diversion
- 3 requirements.
- 4 Representatives from the city are available to
- 5 answer questions.
- 6 This concludes my presentation.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 8 Member Peace.
- 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move
- 10 Resolution Number 2003-96, consideration of the 1999-2000
- 11 biennial findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
- 12 Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the City
- 13 of La Mesa, San Diego County.
- 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Board Member
- 16 Peace, a second by Board Member Medina.
- 17 Substitute the previous roll?
- 18 On consent?
- 19 I hate to tell you, folks, but that one was at 42
- 20 percent and got good-faith effort, because it's got real
- 21 programs. We've got to get the message, got to keep
- 22 hammering the message out there.
- 23 All right. Next item.
- 24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item 34 is
- 25 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings

- 1 for the City of Agoura Hills, Los Angeles County.
- 2 Steve Uselton will present.
- 3 MR. USELTON: Good morning, Chair and Committee
- 4 members.
- 5 The City of Agoura Hills' diversion rate for '99
- 6 was 29 percent and in 2000 was 46 percent. The large
- 7 increase in the diversion rate is attributable to a
- 8 disposal allocation correction that was researched in the
- 9 year 2000.
- 10 To determine the level of program implementation
- 11 a site verification visit was done, and we analyzed the
- 12 effectiveness of various sector programs.
- Some of the major programs that had been
- 14 implemented include source-separated curbside collection
- 15 of green waste and recyclables. And recyclables are
- 16 collected in many 95-gallon automated containers. And the
- 17 green waste is collected in a 65-gallon automated
- 18 container.
- 19 I'm sorry. Switch those. The Green waste in a
- 20 95-gallon container and the recyclables in a 65-gallon
- 21 container.
- The program also includes pay-as-you-throw
- 23 provisions on the disposal containers.
- In 1995 the city passed an ordinance also
- 25 requiring commercial waste haulers to provide all

- 1 commercial accounts with recycling services. Grass
- 2 cycling is done at city parks, medians, and golf courses.
- 3 And the city actively diverts construction and demolition
- 4 debris from city projects and is developing a C&D
- 5 ordinance to target private sector C&D projects.
- 6 Staff recommends that the Board find the City of
- 7 Agoura Hills has made a good-faith effort in meeting
- 8 diversion requirements.
- 9 A Representative of the city is present to answer
- 10 any questions.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I have no questions. I
- 13 just want to know that they have made the effort to
- 14 distribute materials bilingually, they have materials out
- 15 in Spanish as well as in English.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Absolutely.
- 17 All right. Mr. Medina.
- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 19 Resolution 2003-97, consideration of the '99-2000 biennial
- 20 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
- 21 Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the City
- 22 of Agoura Hills, Los Angeles County.
- 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 25 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.

```
1 Substitute the previous roll?
```

- 2 On consent?
- 3 Thank you, members.
- 4 Next item's been pulled.
- 5 Item O, which 36 in the Board, would be our next
- 6 one, Ferndale.
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. City of
- 8 Ferndale, Humboldt, County.
- 9 Jill Simmons presents.
- 10 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
- 11 Committee members.
- 12 The City of Ferndale's diversion rate for '99 was
- 13 47 percent and for 2000 was 35 percent.
- 14 To determine the level of program implementation
- 15 staff analyzed the historic diversion rate trend. And
- 16 with the exception of 2000, this trend has either exceeded
- 17 the diversion rate goal or has just been slightly below.
- 18 Board staff also conducted a recent site visit of
- 19 the city's waste hauler as well as conducting an extensive
- 20 conference with the jurisdiction.
- 21 The diversion rate decline for 2000 may be
- 22 attributable to several factors.
- 23 In 2000, state and federal projects created a
- 24 disposal over which Ferndale had no control. Every time
- 25 disposal tonnages changes by 23 tons, this impacts the

- 1 diversion rate by 1 percentage point.
- 2 The city's self-haul totals were revised in late
- 3 2000 when the county revised it's quarterly self-haul
- 4 survey methods. This survey improvement that records the
- 5 origin of waste from commercial self-haulers for all loads
- 6 on a continuing basis has increased the amount of
- 7 self-haul disposal allocated to the city.
- 8 Some of the major programs that have been
- 9 implemented include a weekly source-separated curbside
- 10 program that is of no additional charge to municipal waste
- 11 subscribers. Commercial operators may take advantage of
- 12 on-site pick-up services at 20 percent of the cost of
- 13 waste pickup. Commercial and residential sectors may
- 14 avail themselves of self-hauling opportunities for various
- 15 materials to the transfer station for very substantially
- 16 reduced drop-off fees.
- 17 The city and other city/county recyclers have
- 18 started a cooperative advertising effort to promote
- 19 recycling at special events as well as designing and
- 20 printing brochures for various recycling systems.
- 21 The city is currently working with Board staff
- 22 and the waste hauler on methods to maximize use of the
- 23 transfer station's C&D recycling programs.
- 24 Staff recommends the Board find that the City of
- 25 Ferndale has made a good-faith effort in meeting diversion

- 1 requirements.
- 2 This concludes my presentation.
- 3 Board staff and a representative for the city are
- 4 available to answer any questions.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We have one speaker
- 6 slip on this one.
- 7 But I have a question. I just want to make sure
- 8 they've got some reasons why their numbers went down.
- 9 MS. SIMMONS: Exactly.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: In two years when we do the
- 11 biennial reviews, if these numbers are in the same spot,
- 12 then it would be our option to put them on a compliance
- 13 order, correct?
- MS. SIMMONS: Correct.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Because, you know, I
- 16 don't mind looking at, you know, these occurrences,
- 17 especially in small areas. Or even big ones if they get
- 18 inundated with some they have no control over.
- 19 But, you know, every two years this thing is
- 20 going to be reviewed again; because, you know, the excuse
- 21 is only -- I mean their legit, but they only go on for so
- 22 long.
- 23 All right we have one speaker, Liz Citrino.
- 24 MS. CITRINO: Chairman, members of the Committee.
- 25 My name is Liz Citrino.

1 I actually used to be staff for Humboldt County,

- 2 as most of you know, and have a lot of experience with
- 3 both Ferndale and Rio Dell. And I just wanted to make
- 4 sure that you understand that whatever your decision
- 5 today, the City of Ferndale has a continuing commitment to
- 6 improve its performance. Staff, which at this point
- 7 consists of the Assistant City Clerk, is participating
- 8 with a working group at the countywide level to continue
- 9 to look at additional programs that can be implemented and
- 10 to increase and improve their performance to and beyond 50
- 11 percent.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thanks, Liz.
- 13 Any questions?
- 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I just had a comment I
- 15 just want to make, a note regarding the fact that
- 16 according to Gill River Disposal located in Fortuna,
- 17 approximately 98 percent of construction and demolition
- 18 waste by being diverted are reused. Good effort there.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Very good.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: And with that, I'd like
- 21 to move Resolution 2003-101, consideration of the '99-2000
- 22 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 23 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
- 24 for the city of Ferndale, Humboldt County.
- 25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Member

- 2 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 3 Substitute the previous roll?
- 4 On consent?
- 5 Thank you, members.
- 6 Next.
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 37, petition for a
- 8 rural reduction and consideration of the 1999-2000
- 9 biennial review findings for the City of Rio Dell,
- 10 Humboldt County.
- 11 And Jill Simmons will present this item.
- 12 MS. SIMMONS: The City of Rio Dell has submitted
- 13 an application and petition for a rural reduction. The
- 14 city is able to make this request since it has been
- 15 determined by Board staff that they meet the statutory
- 16 definition of rural.
- 17 For the year 2000 the city of achieved 43 percent
- 18 diversion rate, and this is the reduced goal the city is
- 19 requesting.
- 20 The city has implemented the majority of their
- 21 SRRE-collected programs, including several alternative
- 22 programs. However, the city does not anticipate being
- 23 able to attain the 50 percent diversion goal due to the
- 24 following rural barriers:
- 25 Final resources for all municipal functions are

1 limited due to the limited sales tax revenues; the city

- 2 has a very high unemployment rate compared to the county;
- 3 the city is about five hours north of any Bay Area
- 4 markets, which affects the availability and economy of
- 5 diversion.
- 6 Board staff has determined that information
- 7 submitted in the application is adequately documented.
- 8 Based on this information Board staff is recommending that
- 9 the Board approve the submitted application for a rural
- 10 reduction.
- 11 This concludes my presentation. Board staff and
- 12 a representative for the city are available to answer any
- 13 questions.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got one speaker on this
- 15 one too.
- Any questions, members?

17

- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: The only question I
- 19 exactly had is, exactly where is Rio Dell located?
- 20 MS. SIMMONS: It's in Humboldt County, and it is
- 21 along the Redwood City Highway 101. It's a very small
- 22 rural community.
- 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Now I place it. Thank
- 24 you.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: It used to be a

- 1 corporation -- corporate town, right? Rio Dell.
- 2 Wasn't Rio Dell a -- was that the one right next
- 3 to the corporate town?
- 4 All right. Liz Citrino.
- 5 MS. CITRINO: Again, Liz Citrino, former employee
- 6 of Humboldt county.
- 7 Rio Dell is located right next to Scotia, which
- 8 is the company town of Pacific Lumber, on 101, a little
- 9 bit south of Fortuna. They're served by the same waste
- 10 hauler and recycler that serves Fortuna and Ferndale.
- 11 And I think that, again -- I have not seen
- 12 evidence on the part of Rio Dell that they're going to
- 13 back away from their commitment to support programs. They
- 14 have a really active program that's run through the school
- 15 that they funded through a Department of Conservation
- 16 grant called the Valet Recycling Program. I think Board
- 17 staff were there for the kickoff of the program, where
- 18 people in the community actually can bring their very
- 19 recyclables to the school two afternoons a week. And
- 20 student volunteers help unload and recycle materials.
- 21 So they definitely have done what they can with
- 22 their limited resources to be creative and to uphold their
- 23 commitment to the program.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Questions?
- Mr. Medina.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

- 2 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-100,
- 3 consideration of a petition for a rural reduction of the
- 4 diversion requirements and consideration of the '99-2000
- 5 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 6 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
- 7 for the City of Rio Dell in Humboldt County.
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Member
- 10 Medina, a second by Member Peace,
- 11 Substitute the previous roll?
- 12 On consent?
- 13 Thank you members.
- 14 Next item.
- 15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 39 is
- 16 consideration of a request to extend the due date for
- 17 submittal of the Source Reduction and Recycling Element
- 18 for the City of Aliso Viejo, Orange County.
- 19 And Maria Kakutani will make this presentation.
- Oh, sorry, Kaoru.
- 21 Kaoru Cruz will make this presentation.
- MS. CRUZ: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
- 23 Committee members.
- Newly incorporated cities are required to submit
- 25 within 18 months of incorporation a Source Reduction and

- 1 Recycling Element, SRRE; a Household Hazardous Waste
- 2 Element, HHWE; and a Nondisposal Facility Element, NDFE,
- 3 to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for
- 4 approval.
- 5 The City of Aliso Viejo was incorporated on July
- 6 1st, 2001, and its SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE submittal due date
- 7 was January 1st, 2003.
- 8 The city has requested to extend its due date
- 9 until June 30th, 2003, as the city is currently
- 10 negotiating with its franchise hauler for contract
- 11 extension proposal. And depending on the outcome of the
- 12 contract, the city might have to reexamine the selected
- 13 programs in the community draft SRRE.
- 14 The staff determined the reason for the extension
- 15 is adequate and extension period is reasonable.
- 16 Therefore, staff recommends Option 1, to approve the
- 17 extension request. This concludes my presentation.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I have a question.
- 19 I understand a new jurisdiction doing a franchise
- 20 agreement. Have you had any indication that they're
- 21 developing the SRRE and the documents --
- MS. CRUZ: Yes, they already submitted the
- 23 preliminary draft for comments for the Board and also the
- 24 LTFE. And they received extensive comments. And they
- 25 need to revise that and in addition to including the

- 1 contract.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So there's programs in
- 3 there. I'm not trying to play the hauler's hand or the
- 4 city's hand. I just don't want to see us get in a
- 5 position where we give an extension, they negotiate a
- 6 contract that could limit the amount of activity that's
- 7 going to be performed under the SSRE, and then it comes to
- 8 us with a -- you know, something less than getting them in
- 9 full achievement, and how are we going to deal with that,
- 10 you know, if we're giving them an extension. So I just
- 11 think we need to be aware of it, you know. As long as
- 12 you've seen it --
- 13 MS. CRUZ: Yes.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Yeah, because an
- 15 educational program for 4th graders in backyard composting
- 16 program ain't going to get it done.
- 17 All right. Any questions?
- Mr. Medina.
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 20 Resolution 2003-104, consideration of a rerequest to
- 21 extend the due date for submittal of the Source Reduction
- 22 and Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element,
- 23 and Nondisposal Facility Element by the city of Aliso
- 24 Viejo, Orange County.
- 25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Member

- 2 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 3 Substitute the previous roll?
- 4 On consent?
- 5 Thank you, members.
- 6 Next item.
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Next item is 41. And
- 8 that's consideration of the application for an SB 1066
- 9 alternative diversion requirement by the city of Santee,
- 10 San Diego County.
- Zane Poulson will present.
- MR. POULSON: Good morning again, Committee
- 13 members.
- 14 Board staff conducted a review of the City of
- 15 Santee's diversion program. The City's diversion rate for
- 16 2000 is 32 percent.
- 17 The city's requested an alternative diversion
- 18 requirement of 40 percent until December 31st 2004.
- 19 Staff's analysis of the city's request indicates that the
- 20 application does provide enough information to adequately
- 21 justify a SB 1066 request for alternative diversion
- 22 requirement.
- 23 Based on this information Board staff is
- 24 recommending approval of the city's application as
- 25 submitted for an alternative to the 2000 diversion

1 requirement on the basis of good-faith effort to date to

- 2 implement diversion programs and its plans for future
- 3 implementation.
- 4 Representatives from the city are available to
- 5 answer questions.
- 6 This concludes my presentation.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We're doing both
- 8 Brisbane and Santee?
- 9 MR. POULSON: Just Santee.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Just Santee.
- 11 So what about Brisbane? Brisbane got --
- 12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Brisbane got pulled.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: It got pulled?
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Brisbane got pulled?
- 16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Forty.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I missed that one.
- 18 I'm sorry.
- 19 So this was Santee. Okay.
- 20 All right. I apologize. This is my fault.
- 21 So Santee is going for an ADR. Okay.
- 22 So this is another one that -- on their
- 23 residential curbside system, is this a single stream
- 24 system or is this multi-bin?
- MR. POULSON: I believe it's single stream.

```
1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So we're looking at
```

- 2 the same kind of issues that I brought up before.
- 3 MR. POULSON: They have a landfill located nearby
- 4 that also they're working with on allocation. And they're
- 5 also going from many haulers down to a single hauler.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. So the request is
- 7 for an ADR.
- 8 All right. Since I messed this one up I'll say,
- 9 I'll move adoption of Resolution 2003-105, consideration
- 10 of an application for an SB 1066 alternative diversion
- 11 requirement for the City of Santee in San Diego County.
- 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Jones,
- 14 second by Member Peace.
- 15 Substitute the previous roll?
- 16 On consent?
- 17 All right. Item U, County of Orange.
- 18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Forty-two, SB 1066
- 19 alternative diversion requirement by the unincorporated
- 20 area of the County of Orange.
- 21 And Maria Kakutani will present this one.
- 22 MS. KAKUTANI: Good morning, Committee members.
- 23 The County of Orange has submitted an alternative
- 24 diversion requirement request for meeting the 50 percent
- 25 diversion requirement. The county currently has a

1 non-determined diversion rate for 1999 and an 18 percent

- 2 for 2000. The county is requesting to be granted an ADR
- 3 of 18 percent through June 30th, 2004.
- 4 Board staff conducted a review of the county's
- 5 diversion programs and analysis of the county's ADR
- 6 request. Staff agrees that until the county has fully
- 7 determined an accurate base year, they cannot develop a
- 8 plan projecting the attainment of the 50 percent goal.
- 9 Based on this information, Board staff is
- 10 recommending the Board approve the city's application as
- 11 submitted for the alternative to the 2000 diversion
- 12 requirement on the basis of its good-faith effort to date
- 13 to implement the diversion program and its plans for
- 14 future implementation.
- 15 A representative from the county is available to
- 16 answer questions.
- 17 This concludes my presentation.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, any questions?
- 19 I've just got a couple things.
- 20 To the County of Orange, a lot of jurisdictions
- 21 in Orange County, especially in the north area where
- 22 there's a lot of growth going on, are looking for help
- 23 with C&D and things like that. I know you're in the
- 24 middle of trying a pilot project. I actually wrote a
- 25 letter supporting it, for one very simple reason: Cities

1 in Orange County need to rely on the county to help them

- 2 get diversion through C&D and through things that they
- 3 don't -- may not have necessarily got their hands around.
- 4 So I appreciate that.
- 5 And I really am amazed. This is a copy of a --
- 6 this is normal for people that want to see opposition to
- 7 something. This went to the Jones family down in San Juan
- 8 Capistrano. And it's a warning that the county is trying
- 9 to site a new landfill in their area. And it's asking
- 10 people to call all the city council members to tell them
- 11 they're opposed.
- 12 What this program really is is the material --
- 13 C&D material that would already normally go to the face of
- 14 the landfill to be disposed of is now inside the landfill,
- 15 going to make a right or a left turn, or however you're
- 16 going to set it up, and it's actually going to be
- 17 recycled. Somebody's opposing that. And you can make up
- 18 your own minds as to who might be opposed.
- 19 So I bring it up because you're getting an
- 20 extension. Cities in your county are relying desperately
- 21 on your cooperation and help on programs so that they can
- 22 meet the mandate. And I just wanted people to know the
- 23 barriers that some times come up, whether for competitive
- 24 reasons or for whatever reasons, to try to put out
- 25 whatever fear they can.

```
1 So, Sue Gordan, you need to come up.
```

- 2 MS. GORDAN: If I may make a comment on that
- 3 particular project that we're working on for our south
- 4 county.
- 5 As of yesterday we received notice from an
- 6 attorneys' firm asking for more information about this
- 7 project, which we anticipate is the first volley across
- 8 the bow of litigation. So I just want to emphasize the
- 9 types of challenges that we are up against in Orange
- 10 County to meet the spirit and intent of AB 939. We're all
- 11 working very diligently to try and meet those goals. But
- 12 obviously you can see the types of barriers we face.
- 13 Thank you.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. I'm sorry to hear
- 15 that.
- 16 All right. Members, any questions?
- 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No questions.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Medina.
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 20 Resolution 2003-106, consideration of the application for
- 21 SB 1066 alternative diversion requirement by the
- 22 unincorporated area of on Orange County.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion.
- 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And a second to adopted

- 1 Resolution 2003-106.
- 2 Substitute the previous roll?
- 3 On consent?
- 4 Thank you, members.
- 5 Next item.
- 6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 43, consideration
- 7 of an application for an SB 1066 alternative diversion
- 8 requirement for the City of Laguna Hills, Orange County.
- 9 And Maria Kakutani -- and actually what we'd like
- 10 to do is hear items -- this is one of the ones we'd like
- 11 to pull forward.
- 12 Item 63 first, which technically we must hear.
- 13 This is a consideration of a request to change the base
- 14 year to 2000 and consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial
- 15 review findings for the city, first of all. And then
- 16 we'll go Item 43 after we hear 63.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So 63 is AP in our
- 18 deal?
- 19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. You want to hear that
- 21 first?
- 22 Go ahead.
- MS. KAKUTANI: Good morning.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right.
- MS. KAKUTANI: Good morning, Committee members.

1 When the City of Laguna Hills new base year

- 2 change request was originally submitted it had a diversion
- 3 rate of 44 percent for 2000. In addition Board staff
- 4 conducted a 1999-2000 biennial review of the city's
- 5 Household Hazardous Waste Element program implementation
- 6 to date and found that the city has adequately implemented
- 7 it's HHWE.
- 8 As part of the new base year study review Board
- 9 staff conducted a detailed site visit for the city. Board
- 10 staff's recommended changes can be seen in Attachment 3 of
- 11 the agenda item packet.
- 12 With Board staff recommended changes, the city's
- 13 diversion rate will be 29 percent for their 2000 proposed
- 14 new base year.
- The despite the city's new base year, the city's
- 16 diversion rate remains below 50 percent for the Year 2000.
- 17 Therefore, the city's submitted an alternative diversion
- 18 rate request.
- 19 In addition, Board staff conducted a 1999-2000
- 20 biennial review of the city's Household Hazardous Waste
- 21 Element program implementation to date and found that the
- 22 city has adequately implemented it's HHWE.
- Board staff recommends the Board adopt Option 2
- 24 that would approve the revised base-year change with staff
- 25 recommendations and accept staff's 1999-2000 biennial

- 1 review findings of the city's HHWE.
- 2 Board staff conducted a review of the city's
- 3 diversion programs. The city had a diversion rate of 29
- 4 percent based on a Year 2000 new base year. The city has
- 5 requested a 40 percent alternative diversion requirement
- 6 until December 31st, 2003.
- 7 Staff's analysis of the city's request indicates
- 8 that the application does provide enough information for
- 9 the Board to adequately justify it's SB 1066 request for
- 10 an alternative diversion requirement and recommends
- 11 approving the request.
- 12 Based on this information Board staff is
- 13 recommending Option 1 of the agenda item, which would
- 14 approve the city's application as submitted for an
- 15 alternative to the 2000 diversion requirement on the basis
- 16 of it's good-faith effort to date to implement diversion
- 17 programs and its plans for future implementation.
- 18 A representative from the city is a available to
- 19 answer questions.
- This concludes my presentation. Thank you.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- There were a few examples of diversion that
- 23 weren't even within the jurisdiction's boundaries, which
- 24 happens from time to time.
- 25 Is the consultant going to do some more work for

- 1 these folks, do you know?
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes, they are. I
- 3 believe in this case -- I think Mr. -- they had a prior
- 4 consultant and then had to bring in another consultant to
- 5 be a part of this. And the current consultant is looking
- 6 at doing some future corrections as well.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. So there's
- 8 another one where?
- 9 MS. KAKUTANI: That consultant --
- 10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: William O'Toole?
- 11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Did you want to speak to
- 13 this, Mr. O'Toole, or just -- it was just a question. I
- 14 didn't even know that you had taken it over. I just --
- 15 you know, I feel bad for cities when I see dollars go out
- 16 for these that, you know, then not come back the way
- 17 they -- you know, I don't have a problem if they don't get
- 18 all the answers that they'd hoped they'd get. But I have
- 19 a problem when -- this one was actually cut in half, you
- 20 know. And that's a shame.
- 21 So good luck. I hope you do well.
- 22 Any other questions members?
- 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No questions.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Medina.
- 25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move

1 Resolution 2003-131, consideration of a request to change

- 2 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
- 3 Reduction and Recycling Element, and consideration of the
- 4 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Household
- 5 Hazardous Waste Element for the City of Laguna Hills,
- 6 Orange County.
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 9 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 10 Substitute the previous roll?
- 11 On consent?
- 12 Thank you, members.
- 13 Now, you want to go back, Mr. Schiavo, to Item
- 14 43?
- 15 Forty-three, Laguna hills.
- 16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Resolution.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh, just resolution?
- Okay. We can do that. We have no problem with
- 19 that.
- 20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Resolution 107, if you
- 21 want --
- We follow instructions well.
- Mr. Medina.
- 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- I'd like to move Resolution 2003-107,

1 consideration of the application for a 1066 alternative

- 2 diversion requirement for the City of Laguna hills, Orange
- 3 County.
- 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Board
- 6 Member Medina, second by Board Member Peace.
- 7 Substitute the previous roll?
- 8 On consent?
- 9 Next item.
- 10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Next item is 44,
- 11 consideration of the application for an SB 1066 time
- 12 extension for the City of Port Hueneme, Ventura County.
- 13 And Steve Sorelle will make the presentation.
- 14 MR. SORELLE: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
- 15 Committee members.
- 16 The City of Port Hueneme has requested a 1066
- 17 time extension through December 31st, 2004.
- 18 The city currently has a 19 percent diversion
- 19 rate for '99 and a '39 percent diversion rate for 2000.
- 20 The specific reasons the city needs a time extension are
- 21 to develop the major elements of the plan of, correction
- 22 which are:
- 23 Mandatory citywide residential curbside
- 24 collection of recyclables and related program outreach
- 25 activities; expansion of the commercial recycling program

- 1 by working with the business community and civilian
- 2 contractors on the local Naval Base; enforcement of a
- 3 green waste ordinance for contractors to report required
- 4 green waste diversion.
- 5 The city anticipates an 11 percent increase in
- 6 its diversion rate.
- 7 Board staff has determined that the information
- 8 submitted in the application is adequately documented and
- 9 is recommending that the Board approve the time extension
- 10 request.
- 11 Representatives are present to answer any
- 12 questions.
- This concludes my presentation.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions?
- 16 I am pleased that Port Hueneme is here. I've had
- 17 long discussions with members of that council over the
- 18 years about this process. And I am pleased that they're
- 19 coming in for an extension. And good luck to you in
- 20 fulfilling your mission. I appreciate it. I really do.
- 21 All right. If members don't mind, I want to make
- 22 this motion.
- I'll move adoption of Resolution 2003-108,
- 24 consideration of the application for an SB 1066 time
- 25 extension by the City of Port Hueneme in Ventura County.

```
1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
```

- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Jones, a
- 3 second by Board Member Medina.
- 4 Substitute the previous roll?
- 5 On consent?
- 6 Thank you, members.
- We are rolling.
- 8 We're going to go a little longer before we take
- 9 a break. You okay with that?
- 10 You're fingers are doing all right?
- 11 THE REPORTER: I'm good.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Cool.
- 13 All right. Next item.
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Items 46 and 47 we'd
- 15 like to combine. And these are alternative diversion
- 16 requirements for the cities of Kerman and Mendota in
- 17 Fresno County.
- 18 And Cedar Kehoe will make the presentation.
- MS. KEHOE: Good morning.
- 20 The cities of Kerman and Mendota have requested
- 21 an alternative diversion requirement of 41 percent and 44
- 22 percent respectively through June 2004.
- 23 The cities of Kerman and Mendota have requested
- 24 alternative diversion requirements in lieu of time
- 25 extensions because the cities believe that despite their

```
1 good-faith efforts, they will be unable to meet the 50
```

- 2 percent goal, the cities having had a difficulty reaching
- 3 the 50 percent goal because of inaccuracies related to the
- 4 disposal reporting system.
- 5 In addition, those Fresno County cities are rural
- 6 cities and have not had the support from the county to
- 7 implement many of their programs. The specific reasons
- 8 why both cities have requested the ADR are as follows:
- 9 Lack of funding; lack of available facilities;
- 10 disposal reporting inaccuracies.
- 11 Board staff has determined that the information
- 12 submitted within both applications is adequately
- 13 documented and is recommending that the Board approve the
- 14 ADR of 41 percent for the City of Kerman and 44 percent
- 15 for the City of Mendota, as requested by those cities.
- 16 That concludes my presentation.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: These are both jurisdictions
- 18 that had originally relied to be part of that -- are these
- 19 two that were going to be part of the countywide system --
- MS. KEHOE: That is correct.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: -- they paid their money
- 22 and -- okay, I have no problem with this extension.
- 23 Are there people here from the cities?
- MS. KEHOE: Guess not.
- They are not here.

```
1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: They do say that they're
```

- 2 going to start a new single stream, but that they're going
- 3 to monitor it and they're going to do the education and
- 4 they're going to do the code enforcement. And that's what
- 5 we need to see.
- 6 So please let them know we appreciate that.
- 7 Mr. Medina.
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- 9 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-116,
- 10 consideration of the application for a 1066 alternative
- 11 diversion requirement for the City of Kerman, Fresno
- 12 County.
- 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Board
- 15 Member Medina and a second by Board Member Peace.
- 16 Substitute the previous roll?
- 17 On consent?
- Thank you, members.
- 19 Mr. Medina.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 21 Resolution 2003-117, consideration of the application for
- 22 a 1066 alternative diversion requirement for the City of
- 23 Mendota, Fresno County.
- 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Mr.

- 1 Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 2 Substitute the previous roll?
- 3 On consent?
- 4 Thank you, members.
- 5 Item 48.
- 6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Forty-eight is SB 1066
- 7 time extension for the unincorporated area of San
- 8 Bernardino County.
- 9 And Rebecca Brown will make the presentation.
- MS. BROWN: Good morning.
- 11 Unincorporated San Bernardino County has
- 12 requested an extension through July 31st, 2004. The
- 13 specific reasons the county requests a time extension are
- 14 as follows:
- To overcome the barriers of litigation, the sales
- 16 of hauling companies, and contractual negotiations with
- 17 the landfill operator for landfill programs in order to
- 18 implement the plan of correction.
- 19 When those situations have been resolved the
- 20 county must develop and implement the expanded franchise
- 21 services in its mountain and western regions and the
- 22 expanded drop-off opportunities at the landfills and
- 23 transfer stations. In addition, more time is needed to
- 24 change some of the fee structures for implementing these
- 25 programs.

1 The county anticipates an 11 percent increase in

- 2 its diversion rate.
- 3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Actually we wanted to
- 4 hear Item 49 also with this. And that's Adelanto.
- 5 MS. BROWN: The City of Adelanto has requested an
- 6 extension through March 1st, 2003. The specific reasons
- 7 the city has requested their time extension are:
- 8 To initiate the changes in the programs selected
- 9 for implementation, track the results from those programs
- 10 and make any necessary modifications; to site a new green
- 11 waste drop-off program promoted to the residents and
- 12 follow up with any problems that may develop; and, in
- 13 addition, the city and the prisons will be coordinating
- 14 their efforts to ensure the success of the installation
- 15 and usage of the increased number of recycling containers.
- 16 The City of Adelanto anticipates a 13 percent
- 17 increase in its diversion rate.
- 18 Board staff has determined that the information
- 19 submitted in the applications is adequately documented and
- 20 is recommending that the Board approve the time extension
- 21 requests for both the City of Adelanto and the County of
- 22 San Bernardino.
- 23 Representatives are here to answer any of your
- 24 questions.
- Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Just a couple of things on

- 2 Adelanto.
- 3 They're going to do more single stream. They
- 4 take it to a MRF that we bought, and I think we visited.
- 5 That makes sense. Are they going to stay involved in -- I
- 6 mean make sure that, you know, the education message gets
- 7 to them.
- 8 And then I see they've got a new ordinance
- 9 proposed for C&D --
- MS. BROWN: Yes.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: -- and how to direct that.
- 12 And that's -- is that a pretty good portion of their waste
- 13 stream? Big enough to make a difference, I'm sure.
- 14 MS. BROWN: Adelanto is -- it is a smaller
- 15 community. So any portion of their waste stream is worth
- 16 making attempt to gather. There are some unusual
- 17 situations in that that are -- there's some growth, but --
- 18 and they don't have a nearby opportunity and haven't been
- 19 implementing that as well as could be. So this is a good
- 20 effort.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good.
- 22 All right. So we have two items.
- 23 Mr. Medina.
- 24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- 25 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-118,

1 consideration of the application for a 1066 time extension

- 2 by unincorporated San Bernardino County.
- 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Member
- 5 Medina and a second by Member Peace.
- 6 Substitute the previous roll?
- 7 Mr. Medina.
- 8 And on consent.
- 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 10 Resolution 2003-119, consideration of the application for
- 11 a 1066 time extension by the City of Adelanto, San
- 12 Bernardino County.
- 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina, a
- 15 second by Board Member Peace.
- 16 Substitute the previous roll?
- 17 On consent?
- Thank you, members.
- 19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. We'd like to --
- 20 Items 62 and 50 are linked, and we'd like to hear 62
- 21 first, or present first.
- 22 And this is the consideration of a request to
- 23 change the base year to 2000 and consideration of the
- 24 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the unincorporated
- 25 area of Nevada County.

```
1 And Kyle Pogue will make the presentation.
```

- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Item 62, that's the
- 3 first one?
- 4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes.
- 5 MR. POGUE: Hello again.
- 6 Nevada County's base year change request as a
- 7 originally submitted had a diversion rate of 34 percent
- 8 for 2000. With the inclusion of biomass diversion credit,
- 9 the county's 2000 diversion rate is 43 percent.
- 10 In addition, Board staff conducted a 1999-2000
- 11 biennial review of the county's Household Hazardous Waste
- 12 Element program implementation to date and found that the
- 13 county has adequately implemented its HHWE.
- 14 As part of the new base year study review Board
- 15 staff conducted a detailed site visit for the county.
- 16 Board staff's recommended changes can be seen in
- 17 Attachment 3 of the agenda item packet.
- 18 With Board staff recommended changes the city's
- 19 diversion rate will be 34 percent for 2000 -- for the 2000
- 20 proposed new base year. That's increased to 43 percent
- 21 when biomass diversion credit is included.
- 22 Despite the county's new base year the diversion
- 23 rate remains below 50 percent for the Year 2000.
- 24 Therefore, the county submitted a time extension request.
- 25 Board staff recommends the Board adopt Option 2,

1 that would approve the revised base-year change with staff

- 2 recommendations, approve the county's biomass diversion
- 3 claim, and accept staff's 1999-2000 biennial review
- 4 findings for the county's Household Hazardous Waste
- 5 Element.
- 6 Now move on to the time extension portion of the
- 7 presentation.
- 8 Board staff conducted a review of the county's
- 9 diversion programs. County has diversion rate of 43
- 10 percent based on the new 2000 base year and inclusion of
- 11 biomass diversion credit.
- 12 County has requested a time extension request
- 13 until December 31st, 2004. Staff has determined that that
- 14 application provides sufficient information to justify its
- 15 time extension request and, therefore, recommends
- 16 approving that request.
- 17 Based on this information Board staff is
- 18 recommending Option 1 of that agenda item, which would
- 19 approve the county's application for a time extension to
- 20 the 2000 diversion requirement on the basis of its
- 21 good-faith effort to date to implement diversion programs
- 22 and its plan for future implementation.
- 23 Tracy Harper from Nevada County is available if
- 24 you have any questions.
- 25 And that concludes my presentation.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

- 2 Mr. Medina.
- 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 4 Resolution 2003-138, consideration of a request to change
- 5 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
- 6 Reduction and Recycling Element, consideration of the
- 7 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Household
- 8 Hazardous Waste Element for the unincorporated area of
- 9 Nevada County.
- 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Board
- 12 Member Medina, a second by Board Member peace.
- 13 Substitute the previous roll?
- 14 On consent?
- Mr. Medina.
- 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 17 Resolution 2003-140, consideration of the application for
- 18 a 1066 time extension by the unincorporated area of Nevada
- 19 County.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Mr.
- 22 Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 23 Substitute the previous roll?
- On consent?
- 25 All right. Mr. Schiavo, that's the end of my

- 1 first binder. So --
- 2 (Laughter.)
- 3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Let's take -- we're going to
- 4 take 10 minutes. We'll be back here in 10 or 12 minutes.
- 5 We'll be back at 25 minutes till.
- 6 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)
- 7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. We will call this
- 8 back to order.
- 9 Members, any ex partes?
- 10 Ms. Peace.
- 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yes, I just had to meet
- 12 and greet with Jerry Wassmer, City of Avalon; Steve South,
- 13 Edco; Michelle Leonard from CS -- SCS Engineering.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And, Mr. Medina.
- 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, Jerry Watson,
- 16 Public Works Director, City of Avenal.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. And I also said hi to
- 18 Jerry. And he was proud that his city was on a compliance
- 19 order, and they're off it and doing a good job. And they
- 20 have done a good job.
- 21 And then Michael Meacham. Always good to see
- 22 him.
- 23 And I think that was it for me.
- Mr. Schiavo, we are on Item #51, Chula Vista.
- 25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And this is an SB 1066

- 1 alternative diversion requirement for the city.
- 2 And Zane Poulson will present.
- 3 MR. POULSON: Good morning again, Committee
- 4 members.
- 5 Board staff conducted a review of the City of
- 6 Chula Vista's diversion programs. The city's diversion
- 7 rate for 2000 is 34 percent. The city has requested a 39
- 8 percent alternative diversion requirement until December
- 9 31st, 2003.
- 10 Staff's analysis of the city's request indicates
- 11 that the application does provide enough information to
- 12 adequately justify its SB 1066 request for an alternative
- 13 diversion requirement. Based on this information Board
- 14 staff is recommending approval of the city's application
- 15 as submitted for an alternative to the 2000 diversion
- 16 requirement on the basis of its good-faith effort to date
- 17 to implement diversion programs and its plans for future
- 18 implementation.
- 19 A representative from the city is available to
- 20 answer your questions.
- 21 This concludes my presentation.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We have one speaker
- 23 slip. Mr. Meacham.
- MR. MEACHAM: Good morning, Chairman Jones, Board
- 25 Members and staff. Thank you for this time to get an

- 1 opportunity to speak before you today.
- 2 I wanted to talk about a couple of things, both
- 3 some successes and some concerns. The City of Chula
- 4 Vista -- and please make no about it -- the City of Chula
- 5 Vista, particularly our residents and our council are very
- 6 committed to the purpose, the intent, and spirit behind
- 7 the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989.
- 8 We think it's a very important law. We take it very
- 9 seriously.
- 10 My predecessor submitted a Source Reduction and
- 11 Recycling Element that had 42 commitments on it. I'm told
- 12 by Board staff that the average is somewhere in the mid to
- 13 high 20's. We have executed those and executed them
- 14 faithfully and continue to do so. In fact, in the late
- 15 1990's because of the development of our franchise and
- 16 where we were at and the opportunity to renegotiate, we
- 17 put a lot of very positive, creative things in place. If
- 18 you drive through Chula Vista today, you will see all
- 19 kinds of color-coded white and mixed paper bins behind
- 20 virtually every business or every strip mall in the city.
- 21 You will see bottle and can bins in gas stations and
- 22 restaurants and every place that you go. If you go to
- 23 construction sites, even though we're working on a model
- 24 ordinance as a leader in the county for the entire county
- 25 with a number of other jurisdiction, we hand out with

1 every permit in the City of Chula Vista a construction

- 2 demolition mandatory recycling ordinance sheet that lists
- 3 also the places they can take material to.
- 4 But the challenge, I think -- and those are just
- 5 a few programs, obviously. We have 42 listed. But the
- 6 challenge I think that we are facing and that the Board
- 7 and staff are facing, despite their tremendous efforts, is
- 8 that you're working with one hand tied behind your back
- 9 and your legs hobbled as long as you're working with a
- 10 formula, which you didn't create, which has had some
- 11 significant flaws from the beginning.
- 12 We were at 42 percent, 45 percent in 1995, in
- 13 terms of diversion. As Zane said, I believe we're down to
- 14 34 percent for 2000. But according to the numbers that
- 15 just came out just a couple weeks ago, we'll be going down
- 16 to 18 percent in 2001. And given how aggressive we are,
- 17 given how -- you know, when I look across the fence and
- 18 visit other cities, how well we are doing in our programs,
- 19 I find that incredibly hard to believe.
- 20 But I also know that when we find out that trucks
- 21 from Mexico are bringing trash back to Chula Vista to a
- 22 landfill in Chula Vista and designating Chula Vista when
- 23 it comes from Mexico, when we've got to spend money on
- 24 consultants to figure all that out -- just as today, we
- 25 talked about people doing studies and counting how many

- 1 yardscape people and landscape people counting the
- 2 material, I thought we were on a disposal-based system and
- 3 that we had gone away from the accounting system. Now we
- 4 really have a hybrid of both. That's a challenge and a
- 5 difficult thing.
- 6 The most important thing I think about that is
- 7 where do you want us to spend our money? If we really are
- 8 committed to the programs, if we really can demonstrate a
- 9 variety of tremendous programs and you can see them on the
- 10 curb and behind business, don't you want us to spend our
- 11 money there instead of the \$30,000 it's going to cost me
- 12 to do this new base year study? And, by the way, the
- 13 base-year study shows that we're going to be in the low
- 14 50's, we are going to be there. But it's going to be a
- 15 result of a accounting errors, not as a result in putting
- 16 in new and better programs we'd like to focus our effort.
- I know you have a lot of business today. I just
- 18 briefly want to mention that -- well, to reinforce
- 19 something that Chairman Jones said. In February of 2002
- 20 the City of Chula Vista was still on 18-gallon
- 21 single-stream residential and small business recycling
- 22 program. We switched March, April, and May to a 64 or 96
- 23 gallon recycling cart, plus -- automated, plus an
- 24 automated trash program where people have a choice.
- 25 Instead of being a victim of the system, they're having

- 1 one trash -- actually it was an unlimited program where
- 2 one person could put one can and another person put out
- 3 ten cans, and they'd pay the same thing. Now, they have a
- 4 choice between a 32, a 64, and a 96 gallon can. There's a
- 5 \$3 spread between those choices. Recycling is at no
- 6 additional charge. Yard waste is at no additional charge.
- 7 Bulky pick up, it helps us recycle a tremendous amount of
- 8 metal, is at no additional charge. The landfill passes
- 9 they get require them -- two free landfill passes per year
- 10 and two free yard waste passes per year require them to
- 11 source separate before they go to the landfill to benefit
- 12 from each of those \$35 value passes.
- 13 But most importantly, in making that change in a
- 14 short four-month period, we went from 675, 680 tons of
- 15 recyclables per month to over 1600 tons of recyclables,
- 16 more than double, close to triple in less than nine
- 17 months. It is a valuable program.
- But I'd like to point out something that wasn't
- 19 mentioned earlier, it costs a lot of money. We have spent
- 20 more than \$450,000 in this first nine months. Our program
- 21 used to be profitable. The city used to get about
- 22 \$250,000 at its height -- I shouldn't say always -- but at
- 23 its height got \$250,000 in profit. All that was required
- 24 to be rolled back to public education. That money's lost.
- 25 Having said that, the goal has always been

1 diversion. It has not been to make a profit. So it's not

- 2 an unreasonable request. And I think it's convenient,
- 3 it's easy. The residents and small businesses love it,
- 4 and I'm glad we did it.
- 5 Thank you for your time.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And, Michael, you also have
- 7 code enforcement that you call recycling specialists or
- 8 something?
- 9 MR. MEACHAM: Yes Mr. Chair. But one of the
- 10 critical parts of our program is we have two recycling
- 11 specialists that actually are paid for by our private
- 12 hauler by contract. And they go door to door every single
- 13 day, even on Saturdays after holidays. They are not code
- 14 enforcement people who are trained as code enforcement.
- 15 They are recycling people who are trained as recycling
- 16 people. They have code enforcement ability, which is
- 17 important. They can write the big tickets and go through
- 18 the legal procedure.
- 19 But an even better component I think is that in
- 20 our resolution under our trash ordinance we have the
- 21 ability to fine people \$10 per improper set out. We ramp
- 22 that up from 3 to 5 to 10. But I think a big reason why
- 23 we doubled or tripled our diversion is because those
- 24 people are out there everyday setting a nice little letter
- 25 after three what we call "oops" tags where they get

1 instructions, they get a letter from the city that says,

- 2 "You're not doing this right. One more time, you get
- 3 fined." An we've fined hundreds of people.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We're having a workshop. We
- 5 need you up here.
- 6 MR. MEACHAM: Thank you.
- 7 All right. Any questions, members?
- 8 Ms. Peace.
- 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I would like to
- 10 move Resolution Number 2003-120, consideration of the
- 11 application for an SB 1066 alternative diversion
- 12 requirement by the city of Chula Vista, San Diego County.
- 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 15 Member Peace, a second by Board Member Medina.
- 16 Call the roll, Jeannine.
- 17 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?
- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 19 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Peace?
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.
- 21 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?
- 22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.
- On consent, members?
- Okay. Next item is --
- 25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Fifty-two is

1 consideration of the application for an SB 1066 time

- extension by the City of Pomona, Los Angeles County.
- 3 And Steve Uselton will present this item.
- 4 MR. USELTON: Good morning, Committee members.
- 5 The City of Pomona has requested a time extension
- 6 through December 31st, 2004. The specific reasons the
- 7 city needs a time extension are as follows:
- 8 It will be implementing commercial hauler
- 9 programs that currently has not achieved diversion
- 10 requirements that are already in place within the city.
- 11 Thus the city will require each hauler to now prepare a
- 12 diversion plan on how each hauler will achieve 50 percent
- 13 diversion. Hauler programs will be audited, and technical
- 14 assistance support will be provided by the city.
- The city will also enact a new C&D ordinance that
- 16 requires 50 percent diversion from the building permit
- 17 applicant. And penalties will be assessed for
- 18 noncompliance.
- 19 The city will also conduct technical outreach to
- 20 the largest 25 generators in order to encourage additional
- 21 waste diversion programs.
- 22 The city anticipates a 9 percent increase in the
- 23 diversion rate through these programs.
- 24 Board staff has determined that the information
- 25 submitted in the application is adequately documented.

1 And based on this information, Board staff is recommending

- 2 that the Board approve the city's time extension request.
- 3 That concludes my presentation.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 5 Got a motion, Mr. Medina?
- 6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 7 Resolution 2003-121, consideration of the application for
- 8 a 1066 time extension by the City of Pomona, Los Angeles
- 9 County.
- 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Member
- 12 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 13 Substitute the previous roll?
- On consent, members?
- 15 Thank you.
- 16 Next item.
- 17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And this is an SB 1066
- 18 time extension for the City of Santa Clarita.
- 19 And Steve will present this also.
- 20 MR. USELTON: Pat, I think we'll need to move to
- 21 Item 67, the base year --
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Oh, I'm sorry.
- Okay. Item 67 will be heard first. And that's
- 24 changing the base year to 2000 for the City of Santa
- 25 Clarita.

- 1 Steve will present.
- 2 MR. USELTON: The City of Santa Clarita
- 3 originally submitted a new base-year change request with a
- 4 diversion rate of 44 percent. As part of the base-year
- 5 study review Board staff conducted a detailed site visit
- 6 and discovered some additions and deductions. The city
- 7 study also identified a 38,677 ton allocation error in the
- 8 2000 disposal amounts.
- 9 The city provided all necessary documentation to
- 10 request a removal of this amount from the diversion rate
- 11 calculation. Staff is, therefore, recommending through
- 12 deductions and additions to the city's originally
- 13 submitted base year study a revised 2000 diversion rate of
- 14 42 percent. The staff recommended changes can be viewed
- 15 in their entirety in Attachment 3.
- 16 The city appears to have programs to support the
- 17 proposed staff-recommended diversion rate. And the city
- 18 has requested a time extension, which will be presented to
- 19 the Committee at today's meeting pending approval of the
- 20 base year study.
- 21 The board staff has determined that the base-year
- 22 change request is adequately documented. Based on this
- 23 information, Board staff is recommending Option 2 that
- 24 would approve the revised new base year with the staff
- 25 recommendation.

1 Representatives from the city are present to

- 2 answer questions.
- 3 And that concludes my presentation.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- 5 Any questions of staff?
- 6 We do have one speaker.
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No questions.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jason Smisko.
- 9 I know I butchered this name. Sorry.
- 10 MR. SMISKO: Good morning, Chair Jones and
- 11 members of the Committee. Jason Smisko, interim
- 12 Environmental Services Manager of the City of Santa
- 13 Clarita.
- 14 Obviously an endeavor such as a base-year study
- 15 really requires the cooperation across the board of a
- 16 couple of different agencies throughout the City of Santa
- 17 Clarita, our consultants, SCS, and certainly, importantly,
- 18 the Board staff.
- 19 I'd really like to acknowledge Steve Uselton and
- 20 his associate Jennifer Wallin. They were extremely
- 21 professional throughout this process and gave us some
- 22 great feedback, some excellent direction, identified some
- 23 additional diversion opportunities for us, and really kind
- 24 of gave us a lot of comfort as we went through a process
- 25 that for us was quite scary.

1 The process of preparing this base-year study has

- 2 been a tremendous benefit to the city. It's really
- 3 engaged our community into all the positive aspects of
- 4 reducing, reusing and recycling. It's put our haulers on
- 5 notice that they're accountable for their operations and
- 6 their actions. And it's also made us just kind of
- 7 understand how these programs all work.
- 8 So thanks a lot for that.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We appreciate it. Your city
- 10 was nice hosts to us a couple of years ago, I think two or
- 11 three years ago, weren't you, to our Board meetings. And
- 12 back then there was a real commitment that was -- that we
- 13 could -- I think all of us got a sense of.
- 14 So we appreciate the comments.
- 15 Members, any questions, comments?
- Mr. Medina.
- 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: No questions.
- 18 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-135,
- 19 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
- 20 for the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling
- 21 Element for the City of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County.
- 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
- 24 Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 25 Substitute the previous roll?

- 1 On consent?
- 2 I will say, in your curbside description you
- 3 talked about participation. You also talked about
- 4 contamination. That's the kind of detail that when cities
- 5 get involved are going to make these programs work. So
- 6 thanks.
- 7 Mr. Medina.
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 9 Resolution 2003-122, consideration of the application for
- 10 a 1066 time extension by the city of Santa Clarita, Los
- 11 Angeles County.
- 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
- 14 Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 15 Substitute the previous roll?
- 16 On consent?
- 17 Thank you, members.
- 18 Next item.
- 19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Next Item -- 54
- 20 is pulled.
- 21 And then we have --
- 22 MR. USELTON: We still need to do the item time
- 23 extension.
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Oh, Steve, I'm sorry.
- 25 MR. USELTON: I think we still need to do that

- 1 item for --
- 2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah, we didn't do
- 3 the -- well, it's okay.
- 4 Steve, is it okay?
- 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: What do we need to -- hold
- 6 it. Wait, wait. We did --
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We didn't do the
- 8 presentation, but you voted on the resolution.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, you convinced us.
- 10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: So that's fine.
- 11 CHAIRPESON JONES: What are you worried about?
- 12 What, you think we don't read your stuff? You can't tell
- 13 by our questions we read your stuff?
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Steve's just so
- 15 thorough.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: He's just too thorough,
- 17 that's right.
- 18 All right. It's okay.
- We'll move on to Item AH, Item 55.
- 20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. And we will
- 21 combine Items 55 and 56. And these are consideration to
- 22 change the base years to 2000 for the cities of Banning
- 23 and Corona and approve the biennial reviews. And Zane
- 24 Poulson will present.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Before you do. On the

1 Davis one that's been pulled, there is a need I think for

- 2 staff to talk to the City of Davis. This is another
- 3 example where the city's doing good on its diversion
- 4 programs and numbers. Went out and did a base year. Base
- 5 year didn't follow the prescription. What was supposed to
- 6 be random wasn't random. Bunch of stuff had to get
- 7 subtracted. The city is now looking at a much lower
- 8 diversion rate than what the default would have been.
- 9 We've got a policy that we've used for at least
- 10 the last three to four years that we're mandated to use
- 11 the best numbers available to us. The best numbers
- 12 available were the numbers that were put forward in the
- 13 new base year, not the default numbers.
- 14 So I would suggest that you call the city, have
- 15 them get that consultant back out there and doing some
- 16 work to finish that study up. Because we can't revert
- 17 back to something that's a convenient number when we know
- 18 that there's other -- you know, that we've been presenting
- 19 something that's a much different picture.
- 20 If the members are okay with that direction to
- 21 staff.
- 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes.
- 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yes.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay Go ahead and let the
- 25 city know. And, you know, I mean it's -- well, you all

1 know how I feel about this inadequate work. So thanks.

- 2 MR. POULSON: Okay. Good morning again,
- 3 Committee members.
- 4 The City of Banning originally submitted a new
- 5 base year change request with a diversion rate of 53
- 6 percent. As part of the base-year study review Board
- 7 staff conducted a detailed site visit. The Board staff's
- 8 recommended changes in diversion rate will be 44 percent
- 9 for their 2000 proposed new base year.
- 10 Board staff proposed changes can be seen in their
- 11 entirety in Attachment 3 of the agenda item packet.
- 12 In addition, the city has submitted a request for
- 13 an SB 1066 time extension, which we'll be bringing forward
- 14 for the Board's consideration at the March Committee --
- 15 the Board meeting.
- Board staff recommends the Board adopt Option 2,
- 17 which would approve the revised base-year change with
- 18 staff recommendations.
- 19 A Representative from the city's available to
- 20 answer any questions.
- 21 The City of Corona. The city's new base year
- 22 change request as originally submitted had a diversion
- 23 rate of 60 percent for 2000. That included statistical
- 24 methods to extrapolate the nonresidential diversion from a
- 25 sample of businesses within the city. Contracted

- 1 statisticians as well as Board staff reviewed the
- 2 extrapolation methodologies and determined the sampling
- 3 methodologies used in the extrapolation did not meet
- 4 statistical requirements for conducting random surveys.
- 5 Board staff, therefore, recommend that the additional
- 6 diversion from extrapolation not be allowed in the new
- 7 base year request.
- 8 As part of the new base-year study review Board
- 9 staff conducted a detailed site visit for the city. Board
- 10 staff recommended changes can be seen in their Attachment
- 11 3 of the agenda item packet.
- 12 The Board staff recommended changes to the city's
- 13 diversion rate would be 49 percent for the proposed 2000
- 14 new base-year study. The city is also claiming biomass
- 15 for the year 2000, which will add 10 percent, the maximum
- 16 allotted percent, to their division rate, giving them a
- 17 diversion rate of 59 percent for the year 2000.
- 18 Board staff also conducted a review of the city's
- 19 diversion programs. The city reported that they have
- 20 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
- 21 composting, and public education programs in order to meet
- 22 the 50 percent diversion goal.
- 23 Based on this information Board staff is
- 24 recommending Option 1 of the agenda item, which would
- 25 approve the city's 2000 new base-year study with the

1 staff-recommended changes and the city's biomass claim,

- 2 and accept the 1999-2000 biennial review findings.
- 3 And a representative from the city's available to
- 4 answer questions.
- 5 This concludes my presentation.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, questions?
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I just had a question
- 8 with regard to the City of Corona.
- 9 Is there a prison located there?
- 10 MR. POULSON: No, I don't believe there's any
- 11 prisons in Corona.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. Mr. Medina.
- 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 14 Resolution 2003-124, consideration of a request to change
- 15 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
- 16 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
- 17 Waste Element for the City of Banning, Riverside County.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Board Member
- 19 Medina.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: A second by Board Member
- 22 Peace.
- 23 Substitute the previous roll?
- 24 On Consent?
- Mr. Medina.

```
1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
```

- 2 Resolution 2003-125, consideration of a request to change
- 3 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
- 4 Reduction and Recycling Element, and consideration of the
- 5 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction
- 6 and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste
- 7 Element for the City of Corona, Riverside County.
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Board Member
- 10 Medina and a second by Board Member Peace.
- 11 Substitute the previous roll?
- 12 On consent?
- Thank you, members.
- 14 Next item.
- 15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 57 is a
- 16 consideration of a request to correct the base year and
- 17 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
- 18 for the City of Twentynine Palms, San Bernardino County.
- 19 And Rebecca Brown will make the presentation.
- MS. BROWN: Good morning.
- 21 The City of Twentynine Palms has requested to
- 22 correct its 1990 base year. The city's diversion rate
- 23 would be 49 percent for 1999 and 54 percent for 2000 based
- 24 on the city's base-year correction.
- 25 The city annexed the Marine Corps Air Ground

1 Combat Center Military Base in early 2000. During the

- 2 1999-2000 biennial review process the city requested a
- 3 calculation method for its 2000 diversion rate that would
- 4 account for the impact of a base annexation to the city.
- 5 The proposed method corrects the base year by transferring
- 6 the original solid waste generation data for the Marine
- 7 Base from the county's 1990 solid waste generation study
- 8 to the city's base year solid waste generation data.
- 9 Board staff believes that this correction is only
- 10 a transfer of data, not a change to the generation tonnage
- 11 based on new or additional tonnage, and requests that this
- 12 transfer of data be allowed as an exception to the
- 13 conditions for the correction of 1990 and later base
- 14 years.
- 15 In addition, Board staff also conducted a review
- 16 of the city's diversion programs. The city recorded that
- 17 it has successfully implemented source reduction,
- 18 recycling, composting and public education programs to
- 19 meet the 50 percent diversion mandate.
- 20 Based on this information Board staff recommends
- 21 the Board adopt Option 1, that would approve the corrected
- 22 base year and accept staff's 1999-2000 SRRE and HHWE
- 23 biennial review findings, that the city has met the
- 24 program implementation and diversion rate requirements.
- 25 The City Manager, Mr. Swaggert, from the city is

- 1 here to answer any questions.
- 2 And this concludes my presentation.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 4 And I'm assuming that the base is going to
- 5 continue its programs so that the city doesn't get stuck
- 6 with --
- 7 MS. BROWN: Yes. In fact the base is quite
- 8 dynamic. It's already had an NDFE approved for the
- 9 expansion of its MRF and sorting facilities. So it's
- 10 doing a fine job.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Great, great.
- 12 All right. If no questions, Mr. Medina.
- 13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 14 Resolution 2003-126, consideration of a request to correct
- 15 the base year for the previously approved Source Reduction
- 16 and Recycling Element and consideration of the '99-2000
- 17 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
- 18 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
- 19 for the City of Twentynine Palms, San Bernardino County.
- 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 22 Member Medina, a second by Board Member peace.
- 23 Substitute the previous roll?
- 24 And on consent?
- Thank you, members.

- 1 Next item.
- 2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 58 is request to
- 3 change the base year to 2000 and consideration of the
- 4 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the City of Avenal,
- 5 Kings County.
- 6 And Rebecca will present this item.
- 7 MS. BROWN: The City of Avenal originally
- 8 submitted its new base-year change request with a
- 9 diversion rate of 37 percent for 2000.
- 10 As part of the base-year study review Board staff
- 11 conducted a detailed site visit. As a result staff
- 12 recommends both deductions and additions for the revised
- 13 2000 diversion rate of 60 percent. The major deductions
- 14 are for miscalculations from prison diversion. The
- 15 additions are for a construction and demolition project
- 16 that was not initially submitted as well as an
- 17 underestimation of grass cycling. Staff's recommended
- 18 changes can be viewed in detail in Attachment 3.
- 19 Board staff has determined that Avenal has
- 20 adequately documented the information claimed in its new
- 21 base-year request, and based on this information Board
- 22 staff is recommending approval of the new base year.
- 23 Staff also conducted 1999-2000 biennial review
- 24 for the city including site visits in 2002. Staff found
- 25 the jurisdiction has adequately implemented the source

1 reduction, recycling, composting, public education, and

- 2 information programs as outlined in its SRRE and HHWE.
- 3 Because the city has demonstrated adequate of
- 4 implementation of its SRRE an HHWE and has met the 50
- 5 percent diversion requirement, staff recommends the Board
- 6 approve staff's biennial review findings.
- 7 Jerry Watson from the City of Avenal is present
- 8 to answer any questions.
- 9 This concludes my presentation.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?
- 11 You also found about 2300 tons of manure
- 12 composting that's going on.
- MS. BROWN: Right.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So it's nice. I mean they
- 15 came in at 39. You left at 60. That ain't bad. It works
- 16 both ways.
- 17 (Laughter.)
- MS. BROWN: We like to see success.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: No wonder he likes you guys.
- 20 (Laughter.)
- 21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. A motion?
- 22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 23 Resolution 2003-127, consideration of a request to change
- 24 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
- 25 Reduction and Recycling Element, consideration of the

1 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction

- 2 and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste
- 3 Element for the City of Avenal, Kings County.
- 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Board
- 6 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 7 Substitute the previous roll?
- 8 On consent?
- 9 Congratulations, Avenal. Nice job coming off of
- 10 compliance, at that. Good job.
- 11 All right. Next item.
- 12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This is
- 13 consideration -- Item 59 -- consideration of a request to
- 14 change the base year to 1999 and biennial review findings
- 15 for 1999-2000 for Santa Clara, Santa Clara County.
- 16 And Kathy Davis will present.
- MS. DAVIS: Good morning.
- 18 The city originally submitted a new base-year
- 19 change requesting a diversion rate of 45 percent for 1999.
- 20 As part of the base-year study review staff conducted a
- 21 detailed site visit.
- 22 The site visit resulted in several changes to the
- 23 claimed diversion. Board staff proposed changes are
- 24 discussed in their entirety in Attachment 3.
- 25 With the Board staff recommended changes to the

- 1 new base year, the city's diversion rate would be 45
- 2 percent for 1999 and 50 percent for 2000.
- 3 Staff also conducted a review of the city's
- 4 diversion programs. The city reported they have
- 5 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
- 6 composting, and public education programs to meet the 50
- 7 percent diversion goal.
- 8 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
- 9 agenda item, which would approve the revised new base year
- 10 with staff recommendations and accept the '99-2000
- 11 biennial review findings.
- 12 Representatives from the city are present to
- 13 answer any questions.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay, members, any questions
- 16 of staff? We do have one speaker. Rick Mauck.
- 17 MR. MAUCK: Good morning. I'm Rick Mauck. I'm
- 18 the Director of Streets and Automotive Services for the
- 19 City of Santa Clara. I've worked for them for over twenty
- 20 years. I'm also the current SWAN International Treasurer.
- 21 I'd like to acknowledge the Waste Board's staff
- 22 for Kathy Davis, who worked with us, as she was very
- 23 professional and responsive, and we got a lot of good
- 24 information imparted between the two of us.
- 25 I would also like to support the Board's process

1 of focusing on programs and good-faith efforts. I think

- 2 that's really rewarding. I also support the Board going
- 3 forward in this manner, and I support the Board increasing
- 4 their efforts with ADF's, buy-recycled requirements,
- 5 industry provided electronics recycling programs,
- 6 increasing the percent recycled content in materials, and
- 7 expanding them out of materials with recycled content.
- 8 This will allow the cities to reach even higher goals and
- 9 on the road to what we called zero waste. But it will
- 10 help us increase our percentages and keep them high in the
- 11 years in the future.
- 12 I would also request the Board to approve our
- 13 request today as this -- and go on forward from here.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right, Rick.
- Any questions for Mr. Mauck?
- 17 All right. Members.
- 18 Mr. Medina.
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- 20 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-129, consideration of a
- 21 request to change the base year to 1999 for the previously
- 22 approved Source Reduction and Recycling Element, and
- 23 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for
- 24 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
- 25 Hazardous Waste Element for the City of Santa Clara, Santa

- 1 Clara County.
- 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got a motion by Board
- 4 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 5 Substitute the previous roll?
- On consent, members?
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes.
- 8 Thank you.
- 9 All right. Next item.
- 10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Before the next item I
- 11 just want to respond. Mr. Medina had a question regarding
- 12 are there any prisons in Corona. And Trevor checked it
- 13 out on our database. And there is a women's facility that
- 14 houses about 1650 women in the City of Corona.
- 15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: And my question had to
- 16 do with how that was factored into the program.
- 17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And we're going --
- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: -- the figures that
- 19 they're reporting.
- 20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And he's going to track
- 21 that information as well, get the program data.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- Thanks for the question, Mr. Medina. I
- 24 appreciate it.
- Okay. You'll get back to him on that answer?

- 1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay, Great. Thank you.
- 3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And Item 60 is a
- 4 request to change the base year to 2001 for the previously
- 5 approved element for West Contra Costa Integrated Waste
- 6 Management Authority in Contra Costa County.
- 7 And Eric Bissinger will present.
- 8 MR. BISSINGER: Good morning, Board Members.
- 9 The West Contra Costa Integrated Waste Management
- 10 Authority submitted a request to change their base year
- 11 from 1990 to 2001.
- 12 The Authority originally submitted a new
- 13 base-year change request with a diversion rate of 42
- 14 percent for 2001.
- 15 As part of the base-year review study, Board
- 16 staff conducted a detailed site visit. Changes proposed
- 17 by Board staff can be seen in its entirety in Attachment
- 18 3. With these changes West Contra Costa's diversion rate
- 19 for 2001 would be 41 percent.
- 20 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
- 21 agenda item, which would approve the revised new base year
- 22 with staff recommendations.
- 23 A representative from the regional agency is
- 24 present to answer any questions.
- This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

```
1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
```

- 2 Questions of staff members?
- 3 We do have one speaker. Steve Devine.
- 4 MR. DEVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members
- 5 of the Committee. I'm Steve Devine, the Director of the
- 6 West Contra Costa Waste Management Authority, which is a
- 7 five-city regional agency just north of Berkeley.
- 8 The base year adjustment process has been a very
- 9 useful process for us, and we thank your staff for helping
- 10 with it, in particular Eric Bissinger out of the Office of
- 11 Local Assistance.
- 12 The project was both challenging and timely for
- 13 us because our family-owned hauler and landfill operator,
- 14 Richmond Sanitary Service, was purchased shortly before we
- 15 commenced this process. And the effort has been very
- 16 helpful in stressing the importance of accurate disposal
- 17 reporting for the private landfill operator.
- 18 We look forward to appearing before you again
- 19 shortly, in the next month or two, as we'll be seeking
- 20 your endorsement to demonstrate West Contra Costa's effort
- 21 in fully complying with both the spirit and letter of the
- 22 Waste Management Act.
- 23 And thank you again for your time.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.
- 25 Any questions, members?

```
1 Mr. Medina.
```

- 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
- 3 Resolution 2003-99, consideration of a request to change
- 4 the base year to 2001 for previously approved Source
- 5 Reduction and Recycling Element for the West Contra Costa
- 6 Integrated Waste Management Authority.
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 9 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 10 Substitute the previous roll?
- 11 On consent, members?
- 12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes.
- 13 Thank you.
- 14 All right. Next item.
- 15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Sixty-one is
- 16 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
- 17 and consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review
- 18 findings for the City of Moorpark, Ventura County.
- 19 Kaoru Cruz will make the presentation.
- 20 MS. CRUZ: Good morning again.
- 21 First of all I'd like to point out that the item
- 22 has been revised on the web page. In the first paragraph
- 23 on the first page please change the diversion rate the
- 24 city originally submitted from 57 percent to 56 percent.
- 25 The City of Moorpark originally submitted a new

- 1 base year change request with a diversion rate of 56
- 2 percent for Year 2000. As part of the base year study
- 3 review, Board staff conducted the detailed site visit. As
- 4 a result, staff recommends changes and revise diversion
- 5 rate of 51 percent.
- 6 Board staff proposed change can be seen in their
- 7 entirety in Attachment 3.
- 8 Board staff also conducted a review of the city's
- 9 diversion program. The city reports that it has
- 10 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
- 11 composting, and public education programs to meet the 50
- 12 diversion mandate.
- 13 To achieve the diversion goal the city
- 14 implemented various programs such as backyard composting
- 15 workshop, residential and commercial recycling correction,
- 16 curbside green waste collection, residential and
- 17 commercial self-haul green waste correction, business
- 18 waste reduction and recycling program, and C&D recycling
- 19 program.
- 20 The city has single stream curbside program and
- 21 the city implemented an extensive outreach program
- 22 including bilingual materials to educate businesses on
- 23 what to recycle.
- 24 Also, the city conducted the study to evaluate
- 25 contamination levels of the curbside recycling in 1999.

1 The study showed that rate to be 6.5 percent,

- 2 which seems to be a good indicator that their outreach
- 3 effort has been effective and successful.
- 4 Board staff is recommending Option 2 that would
- 5 approve the city's revised new base year with staff
- 6 recommendation and accept staff's 1999-2000 biennial
- 7 review findings for the city.
- 8 A representative from the city is present to
- 9 answer any questions.
- 10 This concludes my presentation.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Are there any questions,
- 12 members? A Representative from the city?
- 13 You don't have to come up.
- 14 I appreciate the 6 percent residual. And that's
- 15 at a material recovery facility?
- And it's pretty consistent, right around 6
- 17 percent residual?
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. Your name?
- 19 MR. BRAN: John Bran.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: John Bran. Sorry. My fault.
- 21 Because some folks are leaving permanent
- 22 facilities and going to other facilities where they'd had
- 23 high residual, legitimately high residual. And all of a
- 24 sudden they end with no residual. And it's amazing how it
- 25 changes from facility to facility.

1 So it's another issue. So I appreciate that.

- 2 Mr. Medina.
- 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- 4 Before I move item, I wanted to commend the city on their
- 5 efforts in environmental justice outreach. Glad to see
- 6 they have a program in place.
- 7 I'd like to move Resolution 2003-130,
- 8 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
- 9 for the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling
- 10 Element, and consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review
- 11 findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling Element
- 12 and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the City of
- 13 Moorpark, Ventura County.
- 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Member
- 16 Medina, a second by Member Peace.
- 17 Substitute the previous roll?
- On consent, members?
- 19 Thank you.
- We've done -- and I think we're on Item 64.
- 21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Sixty-four is a
- 22 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
- 23 and consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings
- 24 for the City of Manteca, San Joaquin County. And Yasmin
- 25 Satter will make this presentation.

1 MS. SATTER: Good morning, Chairman Jones and

- 2 Committee members.
- 3 The City of Manteca originally submitted a new
- 4 base-year change request with a diversion rate of 51
- 5 percent for 2000. As a result of staff's verification
- 6 findings, staff is recommending changes to the base year.
- 7 Based on the changes the base-year diversion rate
- 8 was determined to be 48 percent, and with transformation
- 9 credit, 49 percent for 2000. However, the city submitted
- 10 documentation requesting additional diversion tonnage that
- 11 was previously uncounted for. Staff believes that the
- 12 available data adequately documents that the activities
- 13 meet the criteria of inclusion as diversion representative
- 14 of a normal year. With the additional tonnage, the city's
- 15 diversion rate for 2000 would be 50 percent.
- 16 No extrapolation was used to calculate diversion.
- 17 As part of the base year study review, board
- 18 staff conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff
- 19 proposed changes can be seen in Attachment 3 of the agenda
- 20 package.
- 21 Staff also conducted a review of the city's
- 22 diversion programs. The city reported that they have
- 23 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
- 24 composting, and public education programs in order to meet
- 25 the 50 percent diversion goal.

```
1 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
```

- 2 agenda item, which would approve the revised new base year
- 3 with staff recommendations and accept the 1999-2000
- 4 biennial review findings.
- 5 Representative from the city is present to answer
- 6 any questions you have.
- 7 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, any questions?
- 9 Mr. Medina.
- 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- I'd like to move Resolution 2003-132,
- 12 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
- 13 for the previously improved Source Reduction and Recycling
- 14 Element and consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review
- 15 findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling Element
- 16 and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the City of
- 17 Manteca, San Joaquin County.
- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 20 Member MEDINA, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 21 Substitute the previous roll?
- On consent, members?
- Thank you?
- 24 All right. Next item.
- 25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 65 is a

1 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000

- 2 biennial review findings for 1999 and 2000 for Modesto in
- 3 Stanislaus County.
- 4 And Yasmin will present.
- 5 MS. SATTER: This is actually Item 66, Modesto.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I've got it at 65. Sixty-six
- 7 I show as Stockton. That doesn't mean mine's right.
- 8 Oh, yeah it does. Jeannine put it together. I'm
- 9 sorry.
- 10 (Laughter.)
- 11 MS. SATTER: The City of Modesto originally
- 12 submitted a request for a new base year claiming a
- 13 diversion rate of 61 percent for the year 2000. As a
- 14 result of Board staff's visit to the city and verification
- 15 of the claimed diversion, staff recommends new base year
- 16 diversion rate of 56 percent for 2000. However, with the
- 17 addition of transformation credit, the city's diversion
- 18 rate for 2000 would be 61 percent.
- 19 No extrapolation was used to calculate diversion.
- 20 As part of the base-year study review Board staff
- 21 conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff proposed
- 22 changes can be seen in Attachment 3 of the agenda packet.
- 23 Staff also conducted a review of the city's
- 24 diversion programs. The city reported that they have
- 25 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,

1 composting, and public education programs in order to meet

- 2 the 50 percent diversion goal.
- 3 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
- 4 agenda item, which would approve this revised new base
- 5 year with staff recommendation and accept the 1999-2000
- 6 biennial review findings.
- 7 Representatives from the city are present to
- 8 answer any questions you have.
- 9 This concludes my presentation.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, any questions?
- 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Just a comment.
- 12 I wanted to commend the haulers there, in that
- 13 they charge reduced fees for clean recyclable C&D.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, that's Jill and U.S.A.
- 15 and -- I think they're still operating down in Modesto
- 16 too. All old friends of mine.
- Mr. Medina.
- 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: With that I'd like to
- 19 move Resolution 2003-133, consideration of a request to
- 20 change the base year to 2000 for the previously approved
- 21 Source Reduction and Recycling Element and consideration
- 22 of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source
- 23 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
- 24 Waste Element for the City of Modesto, Stanislaus County.
- 25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board

- 2 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 3 Substitute the previous roll?
- 4 On consent?
- 5 Thank you members.
- 6 Next item.
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 66 -- and this is
- 8 the final base-year item -- this is consideration of a
- 9 request to change the base year to 2000 and consideration
- 10 of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the City of
- 11 Stockton, San Joaquin County.
- 12 And Yasmin will present this item also.
- 13 MS. SATTER: The City of Stockton originally
- 14 submitted a new base-year change request with a diversion
- 15 rate of 56 percent for 2000. As part of the base-year
- 16 study review, Board staff conducted a detailed site visit
- 17 in 2002.
- 18 As a result of staff's verification findings,
- 19 staff is recommending changes to the base year that result
- 20 in a base year diversion rate of 37 percent. The
- 21 diversion rate remains at 37 percent with biomass
- 22 credit -- biomass credit for 2000.
- 23 Staff's proposed changes can be seen in their
- 24 entirety in Attachment 3.
- 25 Some of the major diversion programs the city has

1 implemented include curbside collection of recyclables,

- 2 curbside collection of green waste, business recycling and
- 3 source reduction technical assistance, local government
- 4 and school recycling programs, construction and demolition
- 5 diversion programs.
- 6 Board staff has determined that the base-year
- 7 change request is adequately documented and the city's
- 8 program implementation is adequate despite the less than
- 9 50 percent diversion rate achieved.
- 10 Staff, therefore, recommends the Board adopt
- 11 Option 2, to approve the city's base-year change request
- 12 with staff's recommended changes, and also find that the
- 13 City of Stockton has made a good-faith effort to meet the
- 14 2000 diversion requirement.
- 15 Representatives from the city are present to
- 16 answer any questions you have.
- 17 And this concludes my presentation.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Any questions of staff
- 19 members? Because we do have one speaker.
- Mr. Mike Miller.
- 21 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the
- 22 Board. Mike Miller, Solid Waste Manager for the City of
- 23 Stockton.
- 24 Two points of information we'd like to put on the
- 25 record. First, we'd like to thank Yasmin and our

1 recycling coordinator, Heidi Milander, who works for

- 2 Brown, Vence and Associates. They did a really
- 3 workman-like job on this new base year. It's very tedious
- 4 work, very detailed work, requires a lot of patients. A
- 5 lot of discussion between the city and the Board staff.
- 6 And we learned -- we learned some things we did not know.
- 7 And it was -- it was a very useful process for us.
- 8 Secondly, we have some additional diversion
- 9 tonnage that we need to get credit for. And we will do
- 10 that by providing the necessary documentation. There
- 11 wasn't enough time to produce that documentation so that
- 12 it could be included. We have about 28,500 tons of
- 13 asphalt that the city diverts through new contractors.
- 14 We're having a little trouble getting documentation from
- 15 the contractor who actually processed the material. And
- 16 so that's going to require a little bit more time.
- 17 The other thing is we have a large nut processor
- 18 in Stockton. And they recycle about 10,000 tons of nut
- 19 shells. They transfer it from their Stockton plant to
- 20 their Lodi plant, and we need to provide the documentation
- 21 for that as well. And that should be reflected in our
- 22 total diversion tonnage.
- 23 Another case where we need to -- we actually need
- 24 to investigate further, I think, the that was deducted
- 25 and, that is, about approximately 30,000 were deducted

- 1 from our diversion at a Stockton concrete recycling
- 2 facility, that was reported to us as representing the city
- 3 of Stockton. And when the Board staff contacted them,
- 4 they indicated that only 75 percent was Stockton. So we
- 5 have two different stories here. We'd like to, you know,
- 6 establish the truth basically. What is it? Is it 100, is
- 7 it 75? So we're going to continue to work on that.
- 8 Also there's 10,200 tons of cannery waste that
- 9 was deducted for double counting. And we simply need to
- 10 understand the reason for that. But we -- these are four
- 11 issues that we need to resolve. We will. And so we will
- 12 continue to be in touch with the staff and we'll work this
- 13 out. But we're very pleased with our relationship with
- 14 the Board staff. I can say that for a certainty.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. And I'm assuming,
- 16 staff, these were all issues that came up in the process?
- 17 It takes a while. So no problem; you're doing your job.
- 18 All right. Members.
- 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like move
- 20 Resolution 2003-134 revised, consideration of a request to
- 21 change the base year to 2000 for the previously approved
- 22 Source Reduction and Recycling Element, and consideration
- 23 of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source
- 24 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
- 25 Waste Element for the City of Stockton, San Joaquin

- 1 County.
- 2 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 4 Member Medina, a second by Board Member peace.
- 5 Substitute the previous roll?
- On consent, members?
- 7 Thank you.
- 8 All right. Next item.
- 9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Next item is
- 10 Item Number 68. And this is consideration of a contractor
- 11 to update the statewide characterization of disposed waste
- 12 including rigid plastic packaging containers and used oil
- 13 containers.
- 14 And Nancy Carr -- oh, Tom Rudy will be making
- 15 this presentation.
- 16 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
- 17 Presented as follows.)
- 18 MR. RUDY: Chairman Jones, members of the
- 19 Committee. I'm Tom Rudy with the Waste Analysis Branch.
- 20 And I'll be providing you with some information this
- 21 morning on staff's recommendation for selection of the
- 22 contractor to conduct the 2003-2004 waste characterization
- 23 and rigid plastic packaging containers disposal study.
- But first, for the benefit of new Board Members
- 25 and as a refresher for the rest of us, I'd like to take a

1 minute to discuss what a waste characterization study is

- 2 and why we need to do them on a periodic basis.
- 3 ---00--
- 4 MR. RUDY: What is a waste characterization
- 5 study? It's a determination of what materials are still
- 6 being disposed in the waste stream. And how do we conduct
- 7 those?
- 8 --000--
- 9 MR. RUDY: Well, we start by taking samples of
- 10 waste from garbage trucks or randomly selected disposal
- 11 facilities or from dumpsters at waste generation sources
- 12 such as businesses or apartment complexes.
- 13 ---00--
- MR. RUDY: Each sample is manually sorted into
- 15 the Board's 57 standard material types, plus a few
- 16 specialized RPPC types.
- 17 And I might add, that in this study for the first
- 18 time we'll be including several sub-types of electronic
- 19 waste.
- --000--
- 21 MR. RUDY: Then each material type is weighed and
- 22 its percentage of overall sample is recorded. The process
- 23 continues until we've collected and sorted a sufficient
- 24 number of samples to statistically represent the state's
- 25 disposal waste stream.

1 Then through the magic of statistics, we can

- 2 estimate the types and quantities of materials still being
- 3 disposed.
- 4 --000--
- 5 MR. RUDY: Why do we want to do this? Well,
- 6 quite simply, successful market and diversion program
- 7 development requires knowledge. We need to know what's
- 8 still in our disposed waste stream in order to develop the
- 9 programs and policies necessary to continue to increase
- 10 our diversion and decrease our disposal.
- 11 So that's waste characterization study in a
- 12 nutshell. So let's talk about the contractor selection
- 13 for the new study.
- 14 --000--
- MR. RUDY: In both the September and October 2002
- 16 meetings the board approved funding sources to conduct the
- 17 RPPC and waste characterization study in the amount of
- 18 \$290,000 dollars.
- 19 Our fund scheme approved is as follows: \$75,000
- 20 from the used oil recycling fund; \$40,000 from the RMDZ
- 21 revolving loan account; \$75,000 from the RPPC budget
- 22 change proposal to the FY 2002-2003 IWMA account. And an
- 23 additional \$100,000 from the RPPC budget change proposal
- 24 to the FY 2000-2001 IWMA account.
- 25 ---00---

1 MR. RUDY: The scope of work was presented to and

- 2 approved by the Board at its November 2002 meeting.
- 3 Resulting requests for proposal was released on November
- 4 27th, put the proposals due to the Board's Contract
- 5 Section by January 17th of this year.
- 6 And, finally, the cost proposal opening was
- 7 conducted by contract staff on January 28th.
- 8 --000--
- 9 MR. RUDY: A single proposal was received by the
- 10 established deadline. It was submitted by Cascadia
- 11 Consulting Group of Seattle, Washington, in concert with
- 12 R. W. Beck and several other subcontractors. The proposal
- 13 was evaluated for feasibility and technical merit by
- 14 four -- excuse me -- by five Board staff members
- 15 knowledgeable in the tests to be performed, using the
- 16 criteria established in the RFP. Each member scored the
- 17 proposal independently, and submitted their scoring sheet
- 18 to the contracting officer. The contracting staff then
- 19 compiled the five scores and determined the contractor's
- 20 proposal received a passing score.
- 21 Cost proposal was opened as scheduled on January
- 22 28th and a proposal cost of \$289,650 was within the budget
- 23 established by the Board. Therefore, staff proposes that
- 24 Cascadia Consulting Group be selected as contractor for
- 25 this study.

1 Cascadia is a nationally recognized solid waste

- 2 management consultant located on the West Coast, having
- 3 completed studies of this magnitude for the states of
- 4 Washington and Oregon, as well as our own 1999 California
- 5 statewide study.
- 6 Cascadia also has experience in conducting RPPC
- 7 contamination studies, having conducted the 1995 study for
- 8 American Plastics Council, whose data we currently use.
- 9 R. W. Beck is a nationwide corporation and has
- 10 completed statewide characterization studies in Florida,
- 11 Iowa, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, among other states.
- 12 The sorting of the disposal samples Cascadia
- 13 subcontracts to Sky Valley Associates, a company that
- 14 employs full-time professional waste sorters which
- 15 provides consistency and reliability to the data.
- 16 --000--
- MR. RUDY: Between now and June of this year,
- 18 we'll work to finalize the study design. This study will
- 19 spread the sampling over fours seasons, which is a first
- 20 for us. Normally studies only encompass two seasons.
- 21 The four-season sort will give us a better
- 22 understanding of the effects of the seasonality of
- 23 disposed waste, especially organic materials.
- 24 Field sampling will start in July of this year
- 25 and finish in April of next year. Final report will ready

- 1 in September of 2004.
- 2 --000--
- 3 MR. RUDY: Okay. So what are we going to get for
- 4 our money? Well, I'll cover just some of the major items.
- 5 First, we'll have new waste composition data for
- 6 the single family, multi-family, and overall residential
- 7 sectors, the commercial sector, the self-haul sector, and
- 8 the overall statewide MSW waste stream.
- 9 Second, we'll have updated RPPC disposal amounts
- 10 for each of these sectors and for the overall statewide,
- 11 as well as updated information on RPPC contamination
- 12 rates. These 2 pieces of data will be used to compute the
- 13 new RPPC recycling rates as mandated by statute.
- 14 ---00---
- MR. RUDY: We'll also obtain new data on disposal
- 16 of used oil containers and oil filters in the municipal
- 17 solid waste stream. Again, this data will be obtained for
- 18 each sector as well as overall statewide.
- 19 For the first time we'll be collecting data on
- 20 several E-waste sub-types. We'll be updating our regional
- 21 and statewide per capita disposal rates and our per-unit
- 22 multi-family disposal rates.
- 23 And, finally, we'll have an update on the amount
- 24 each sector contributes to the state's overall waste
- 25 stream.

```
1 --00--
```

- 2 MR. RUDY: The Board is presented with three
- 3 options.
- 4 Option 1, approve Cascadia Consulting Group as
- 5 the proposed contractor for the characterization of
- 6 disposed waste contract.
- 7 Option 2 is, disapprove Cascadia Consulting Group
- 8 as the contractor.
- 9 Or Option 3 is to take no action and to provide
- 10 staff further direction regarding this study.
- 11 --000--
- 12 MR. RUDY: Staff recommends Option 1, approve
- 13 Cascadia Consulting Group as the proposed contractor for
- 14 the characterization of disposed waste contract.
- 15 --00--
- MR. RUDY: Now, this concludes the presentation
- 17 at this time.
- 18 Staff will be glad to entertain any questions,
- 19 which I'm sure there may be one or two.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I have a couple.
- 21 How many people did this thing? I mean Cascadia
- 22 is located where?
- MR. RUDY: In Seattle.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: In Seattle?
- MR. RUDY: Right.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: They have any operations -- I

- 2 think I asked this question in '99, too.
- 3 MR. RUDY: They actually do -- according to their
- 4 proposal and their resume, they actually do these kinds of
- 5 studies, primarily on the West Coast. But in Wisconsin --
- 6 they're really all over the states, our county as well.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Because the last time we
- 8 tried one of these, didn't a lot of the subcontractors
- 9 walk?
- 10 MR. RUDY: They did. Well, not a lot of them.
- 11 It's my understanding that one subcontractor did bail out.
- 12 And he took a bunch of the work with him, if he would have
- 13 done, fell out. Cascadia then in turn still wanted to do
- 14 the contract. So they took over that portion of that
- 15 subcontractor's work to do. And then the Board did some
- 16 as well.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So were they the only
- 18 ones that bid this contract?
- MR. RUDY: Yes.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I had left just for a second.
- 21 MR. RUDY: There's about five major companies
- 22 that do this kind of work on this level, in such scope.
- 23 Cascadia and R. W. Beck are two of them. And
- 24 we're in concert with them. Nancy and I contacted the
- 25 other three.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So R. W. Beck and them

- 2 are in concert. And R. W. Beck's got operations in
- 3 California?
- 4 MR. RUDY: Yes, sir.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: They have offices all over --
- 6 MR. RUDY: They have offices all over the nation.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. You know, because it
- 8 is -- we're in a budget crisis, and it's nice to spend of
- 9 the money in California, you know.
- MR. RUDY: Absolutely.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And then another question.
- 12 In our '99 study -- and you and Nancy know I have major
- 13 heartburn over this -- one of the consultants said garbage
- 14 weighed, I think in that one, 105 pounds per cubic yard.
- 15 A think it's pretty widely known, except -- unless you
- 16 were trying to do a base year study -- that garbage weighs
- 17 a little more than 105 pounds per cubic yard.
- 18 Are we going to rectify that? Because as you're
- 19 doing a waste characterization and you're trying to come
- 20 up with a percentage of the waste stream, if you're using
- 21 a flawed number -- and I don't blame this on you guys,
- 22 okay? This was not your work product.
- 23 And I actually didn't see it, or I would have
- 24 objected the day we accepted the darn thing.
- 25 But if we're going to do percentages of the waste

1 stream and we're using a flawed number for disposal -- you

- 2 know, for MSW, that creates a problem. In my view, it
- 3 skews the percentage all the way down the road. We going
- 4 to fix that?
- 5 MR. RUDY: Well, in this study, we have the same
- 6 problem that we've had in the past. Because we're going
- 7 to be taking stuff out of the truck. And we dump the
- 8 truck on the floor, and we're going to take an unloaded --
- 9 so we end up with a disturbed sample. So the density or
- 10 specific weight measurements we get out of that may or may
- 11 not be accurate.
- 12 This million and a half dollars that may
- 13 materialize in the next budget cycle, perhaps we could
- 14 take some of that money and design a study that we could
- 15 go after that particular data, that density study data.
- 16 Using -- maybe we can get scales on the truck or
- 17 something like that and do some honest data gathering.
- 18 MS. CARR: As far as determining the actual
- 19 portion of each sector --
- 20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Nancy, you need to identify
- 21 yourself.
- MS. CARR: Nancy Carr from the Waste Analysis
- 23 Branch.
- 24 As far as determining the percentage each sector
- 25 contributes to do a waste stream among residential,

- 1 commercial, and self-haul, that will be done using a gate
- 2 survey, where we will weigh the entire truck and determine
- 3 where it's from. So we'll be serving every truck that
- 4 comes into the facilities that we're sampling at that day.
- 5 So we won't need to be looking at density because we'll be
- 6 just weighing the entire load. And then, you know,
- 7 however those percentages work out for that sampling day,
- 8 we'll all be -- as Tom says, through the magic of
- 9 statistics, we can then aggregate up to the statewide
- 10 level. So the density won't really be a factor in that
- 11 part of the study. And since we're not doing generator
- 12 sampling this time, you can't really do density studies.
- 13 We can do it for the multi-family only. But to do that,
- 14 you really have to do a generator study. So if we end up
- 15 doing future studies, then we can't -- that's definitely
- 16 something we would look at in detail.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES:
- 18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: The 105 pounds was
- 19 pretty accurate for what it was. It was just -- you know,
- 20 it was just material laid out, and then there is
- 21 eyeballing of what volume that was. But the biggest
- 22 problem was that it was misused and it was misused for
- 23 other purposes. And that's where it really fell down.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah.
- 25 MR. RUDY: Density is really -- it's business

```
1 specific. So --
```

- 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh, I understand that.
- 3 But --
- 4 MR. RUDY: If we take a -- if we gathered up 1200
- 5 samples, we take an average of each is about --
- 6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right. No, I understand.
- 7 Okay. Any questions, members?
- 8 Mr. Medina.
- 9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
- 10 I'm going to move Resolution 2003-136,
- 11 consideration of a contractor for the contract to update
- 12 statewide waste characterization of disposed waste
- 13 including rigid plastic packaging containers and used oil
- 14 containers, Fiscal Year 2002 through 2003, Contract
- 15 Concept Number 18.
- 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Board
- 18 Member Medina, a second by Board Member Peace.
- 19 Substitute the previous roll?
- 20 This I think has to go on fiscal consent -- is it
- 21 aware of dollars?
- Yeah, it is.
- 23 Fiscal consensus then please.
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item Number 69, our
- 25 last item today. And this is a status update of the

1 review process for the submitted state agency integrated

- 2 waste management plan annual reports, otherwise known as
- 3 AB 75.
- 4 And Trevor O'Shaughnessy is going to present this
- 5 item.
- 6 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning, Committee and
- 7 Chair. My name is Trevor O'Shaughnessy of the State
- 8 Organization of Facility Assistance Section.
- 9 Today I'd like to update you on the status of AB
- 10 75.
- 11 The current status of AB 75 and the submittal of
- 12 the 2002 data or annual report is currently available to
- 13 all state agencies throughout the State of California. A
- 14 distribution of passwords to access this system
- 15 electronically through the Board's website was distributed
- 16 January 13th of 2003.
- 17 As of today there are 70 state agencies that have
- 18 accessed the sort system and a total five state agency
- 19 annual reports have been submitted to the Integrated Waste
- 20 Management Board.
- One area that staff wants to focus on in our
- 22 discussion today is the review process that was used to
- 23 review inter-report submitted for the calendar year 2001,
- 24 and how we would like to use that same process for the
- 25 2002 annual report measurement year.

1 In a review, you would find -- handed out to you

- 2 either just today or earlier this week you were provided
- 3 with administrative procedures or administrative process
- 4 that was forwarded to you from Mark Leary, Executive
- 5 Director, in a memo dated June 27th, 2002.
- 6 This memo outlined the process staff went through
- 7 to review the annual reports for the calendar year 2001,
- 8 and how those annual reports were presented to you as a
- 9 Board through the movement or presentation of a memo
- 10 delivered to each individual office.
- 11 Within that summary report it provided the names
- 12 of the agencies, whether or not they were a full annual
- 13 report or a modified annual report. Within the full
- 14 annual report it also provided their overall diversion
- 15 percentage and the total -- the jurisdiction that they
- 16 were located in and other pertinent information. If
- 17 they're a modified state agency or a modified report,
- 18 within that process they do not submit any diversion or
- 19 measurement data. So we simply provide the name of the
- 20 agency and total number of employees. To be modified, you
- 21 are basically self-certifying that you have a total of
- 22 less than 200 tons of disposal and -- no, wait -- 200
- 23 employees and 100 tons of disposal. Excuse me.
- 24 Also included in that process that was adopted by
- 25 the Board in earlier board action, the Board delegated

- 1 approval authority to the Executive Director. So once a
- 2 memo was forwarded to each individual Board office, if
- 3 nothing was heard within the timeframe specified in the
- 4 letter, which is typically three weeks, it was deemed that
- 5 there was no comments or input from individual Board
- 6 Members, so the Executive Director used his authority to
- 7 then send. If you turn to the second part of your packet,
- 8 a letter of notification of compliance with AB 75 that was
- 9 signed under the authority of Mark Leary.
- 10 With that, if we look at the 2002 measurement
- 11 year, it is a progress or interim measurement within AB
- 12 75, it specifically outlines or requires that the state
- 13 agencies achieve a 25 percent diversion mandate.
- 14 Currently through the information that's been provided in
- 15 the 2001, and staff's review of information that is
- 16 currently being put into the system in all that, most, if
- 17 not all, state agencies should be achieving that 25
- 18 percent diversion mandate.
- 19 But I'd like to remind the Board Members that
- 20 nowhere in the legislation or statute is there any
- 21 punitive or Board action that we can take directly against
- 22 these state agencies.
- 23 We are allowed to review them. We can look at
- 24 them. We can bring them forward. But at this point,
- 25 knowing that it's 25 percent in an interim measurement,

1 staff would like to recommend that we continue to use the

- 2 adopted process where the authority is delegated to the
- 3 Executive Director, we continue providing you with an
- 4 updated memo of the status of the agencies as staff
- 5 completes their reviews of the submitted inter-reports for
- 6 2002.
- 7 With that, staff would like to present that
- 8 there's three areas that we could get direction. One is
- 9 that we continue the process with no changes, that we
- 10 bring forward approved procedures or amend the procedures
- 11 that are in place that the Board did adopt in previous
- 12 Board action, or that the Committee provide us other
- 13 direction.
- 14 Before staff concludes, I'd like to turn over the
- 15 presentation to Phil Moralez, the manager of the branch
- 16 and section.
- 17 MR. MORALEZ: Board Members, quickly, I just
- 18 wanted to make comment in regards to staff's work. Though
- 19 we do have not have binders of information that Trevor's
- 20 staff has provided to Board Members on an ongoing basis,
- 21 they have been very successful following these processes
- 22 and getting almost 100 percent compliance from state
- 23 agencies. They've also been very successful in getting
- 24 larger state agencies like CalTrans, the prisons and
- 25 colleges to work with local government. And I'd like to

1 just acknowledge Trevor's leadership and his staff for the

- 2 hard work that they've done. They're kind of the unsung
- 3 heroes in the background.
- 4 A lot of the work that has been done can be found
- 5 on our website. Every local government, every private
- 6 citizen can access a website and can find out what, if
- 7 any, state agency is or is not doing.
- 8 And so I think that it behooves the Board and for
- 9 me just to knowledge Trevor and his staff for the hard
- 10 work they've done. They may not be a face up in front of
- 11 the dais often making presentations. But they are
- 12 definitely a force out there helping local government and
- 13 state agencies get the job done. So I wanted to
- 14 acknowledge that. I thank you for your indulgence in
- 15 letting me do that. But I think Trevor deserves all the
- 16 accolades for the hard work they've done.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I think you're right. I
- 18 think you all need to get a hand. But, Trevor, nice job.
- 19 Do any members have any questions?
- 20 Okay. The direction that you were seeking was --
- 21 you gave us three options. It only took us about, you
- 22 know, five months to come up with a policy. So why don't
- 23 we toss that one now and we'll just start all over.
- 24 (Laughter.)
- 25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: No. You guys are doing a

- 1 good job. It looks like it's working.
- 2 Members directed me to stay the course.
- 3 Okay. Very good.
- I do want to -- that's our last item.
- 5 I do want to thank Mr. Schiavo.
- Is there anybody that needs to public comment,
- 7 any member of the public?
- 8 I have to apologize. Our newest Board Member,
- 9 Cheryl Peace -- she and I sit on committees. And I heard
- 10 her get introduced the other day. And we've been talking
- 11 quite a bit. And I neglected to do that at the beginning
- 12 of the meeting, and I apologize. So all you people out in
- 13 Internet land, I'll introduce you to our new Board Member,
- 14 Cheryl Peace.
- But we do appreciate, you know, your activity on
- 16 this Board and on this Committee. And you and I sit on
- 17 P&E. And, believe me, you had a lot of activity that day.
- 18 And I appreciate that.
- 19 And I appreciate our staff. But I really
- 20 appreciate our Board Members that will -- they come to
- 21 these meetings. We have huge amounts of items. They come
- 22 prepared. They know what the items are. We're able to
- 23 move through it. I thank all the members for that,
- 24 because we do do a lot of work. You guys provide us the
- 25 background. And I think we got a lot of good stuff done

1	today.
2	If anybody has any comments?
3	All right.
4	COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I just thank you, Chair
5	Jones. And you're doing an excellent job in chairing this
6	Committee. And also I want to welcome Board Member Peace
7	to this Committee.
8	COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. We are adjourned.
10	(Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
11	Management Board, Diversion, Planning and
12	Local Assistance Committee adjourned at
13	11:50 a.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3	Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4	Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:
5	That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6	foregoing California Integrated Waste Management Board,
7	Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Committee meeting
8	was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a
9	Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
10	and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.
11	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12	attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
13	way interested in the outcome of said meeting.
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
15	this 10th day of March, 2003.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
24	Certified Shorthand Reporter
25	License No. 10063